

Library

The Department of State

bulletin

Vol. XXX, No. 780

June 7, 1954



THE GROWTH OF FREEDOM IN INDIA • by Ambassador George V. Allen 864

UNDERSTANDING INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC PROBLEMS • by Marvin L. Bohan 875

ETHIOPIA'S ROLE IN WORLD AFFAIRS • by Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia 867

TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND THE AMERICAN HERITAGE • by Harold E. Stassen 871

A REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE UNDER THE FULBRIGHT ACT IN 1953 889

THE UNITED STATES AND A DIVIDED CHINA • Article by Alfred LoSonne Jenkins 889

For Index see inside back cover



The Department of State bulletin

VOL. XXX, No. 780 • PUBLICATION 5491

June 7, 1954

The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication issued by the Public Services Division, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes selected press releases on foreign policy, issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information is included concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest.

Publications of the Department, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$7.50, foreign \$10.25
Single copy, 20 cents

The printing of this publication has been approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (January 22, 1952).

Note: Contents of this publication are not copyrighted and items contained herein may be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be appreciated.

The United States and a Divided China

by Alfred leSesne Jenkins

Until the Chinese mainland came under Communist domination in 1949, the United States had enjoyed more than a century and a half of friendship with the Chinese people, during which our contacts with China—commercial, cultural, religious, and political—were extensive. Our record in standing for the political independence and territorial integrity of China is a well-known one, and the Second World War found our two peoples comrades-in-arms against the imperialist power of that period which sought to destroy us. The subsequent subjugation of the Chinese mainland to the alien domination of yet another imperialism is not only a cause of deep regret to us because it has severed our traditionally close relations with the vast majority of the Chinese people; it is also a cause of the greatest concern to us, in that a hostile and aggressive China, in collusion with the Soviet Union and its European satellites, vastly enhances the threat of Communist imperialism to our own peace and security and to that of the entire free world.

The oft-confessed objective of Communist imperialism is nothing less than world domination. The Soviet leaders must be well aware that this can never be accomplished with any semblance of legitimacy. Not one national group of the 600 million souls now under Communist rule has ever voted itself into communism. The free world has shown a perverse disinclination to be "liberated" from its free institutions and way of life. Communist successes for the past 37 years have been the result of following Lenin's exhortation to resort to every form of "ruses, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful methods, concealments and belittlings of the truth." Communist tactics have included, in various combinations, infiltration, subversion and sabotage, "united fronts" with other parties while control of army and police is secured, partition of countries which cannot at the time be won in toto, and, when the time seems ripe, coups d'état or civil war. Communist conquest has by no means, therefore, been confined to bald military aggression, although this more conventional method of imperialistic aggrandizement has not been spurned when the odds ap-

peared to be overwhelmingly in the Communists' favor.

This pattern of Communist conquest has become sickeningly familiar since World War II. Its methodology, insidious, resilient, and multi-form as it is, is not easy to combat, but it can be done. The rapid growth of Communist parties in Western Europe immediately after the war has at least been stopped in its tracks. Western Europe, alarmed and awakened chiefly by the fate of Poland and Czechoslovakia, demonstrated its determination to regain its strength promptly and to remain vigilant. Communist imperialism, thwarted in the West by European acceptance of the Marshall plan, the creation of NATO, and the prospect of a European Defense Community, and in the South by the failure of its designs against Greece, Turkey, and Iran, turned its attention to the East, where the first of the three great Asian prizes had all but dropped into its lap.

What the Communists Want in Asia

Both the world Communist conspiracy and Soviet imperialism, to the degree that the two may be distinguished, want of Asia three things. First, communism needs the manpower of China, which constitutes one-fourth of the world's total population. This it now has, except for the Free Chinese on Formosa. Second, it needs the industrial capacity of Japan. This was the ultimate goal in its ill-fated Korean adventure. Third, it needs the surplus food and rich mineral resources of Southeast Asia. Presently threatened Indochina is the gateway to this wealth and contains a good portion of it. This characterization of the three great Asian prizes eyed by Communist imperialism is something of an oversimplification, of course. China, for instance, brings to the Communist fold a good deal more than just manpower, valuable as that is and freely as it was squandered in Korea. The important thing to remember is that the Communist rulers have every intention of using their first great Asian prize as the primary means of attaining the second and third. And the Chinese Communists, for their

part, appear to be close and willing accomplices in this plot, expecting to gain much for themselves as junior partners in the Sino-Soviet alliance. It is also important to remember that the Chinese Communists are thoroughly schooled in the same tradition as their Soviet mentors. The Chinese have proved to be apt pupils and have even added a few twists of their own to the Soviet legacy, both in their internal and external conduct. Communist China's imperialistic adventures in both Korea and in Indochina, although not the same in form, have both followed orthodox Communist patterns.

The best hope of communism is in a situation where it can deal separately and individually with its intended victims. Its spread was halted in Europe only when this became impossible. The Communist attempt to swallow the whole of Korea failed because of united action of a kind unique in history, but Korea remains divided. The Communists so far have been able to concentrate their attention in turn upon Indochina without the deterrent of that collective security which must yet be devised for Free Asia if it is not to be enslaved in the Communist fashion, piecemeal.

Issues of incalculable import are in the balance in Asia at this time. I have dwelt initially upon aspects somewhat broader than our immediate subject in order to set the perspective for the role Communist China has been allotted to play, and indeed is playing, in the world Communist program of conquest. It has been given primary responsibility for the communization of the rest of Asia but has recognized the leadership of the Soviet Union for the whole of the Communist camp.

Since April 26 our representatives have been in Geneva to discuss the two most serious sources of tension in the Far East, the danger spots of Korea and Indochina. In both instances it is primarily Communist China, with the full support of the Soviet Union, which has thus endangered the peace of the world. We are participating in the Conference at Geneva with the sincere purpose of seeking a settlement of these two great Asian problems. We still hope that at least some progress toward reducing tensions in the Far East may be possible. We are, however, keenly aware of the Communists' record of bad faith. We are especially mindful of the Chinese Communists' wonted use of the conference table as a means of waging war by carefully timed cease-fire, a tactic used by them to great advantage in the Chinese civil war. During the cease-fire in Korea, by means of a deliberate and systematic circumvention of the Armistice Agreement, the Communists have engaged in a significant military build-up in North Korea. It would be fatuous to agree at Geneva to a cease-fire in Indochina without adequate safeguards against this all-too-familiar Communist tactic.

Whatever the Communist intent with respect to

Korean and Indochinese settlements, they have stridently demanded that the convicted aggressors whose acts have chiefly made the conference necessary be accorded international acceptance and so-called big-power status in this conference. We and our allies refused to yield to these demands and to convene a so-called five-power conference to deal with world problems, for which the Communists were so anxious. Communist China is necessarily at the conference, since it is deeply involved in both questions to be considered. Communist China obviously wants to achieve, partly by means of this conference itself, general diplomatic recognition by the family of nations, a seat in the United Nations, and a relaxation of trade restrictions.

Nature of Chinese Communist Regime

What is the nature of this regime which unashamedly demands international acceptance at a conference called to deal urgently with problems chiefly of that regime's own creation? It came to power by force of arms and with full moral, and limited material, support of an alien power which even at that time was bound by a treaty of friendship and alliance with the Chinese Government under President Chiang Kai-shek. It came to power by the familiar "united front" tactics, discarded as soon as police state controls made it possible. We do not believe that it represents the will of the people it governs. It has acted on no recognizable standards of international conduct. It has repeatedly expressed contempt for the purposes and principles of the United Nations and still stands convicted by that body as an aggressor in Korea. Its aggressive record in Korea, Indochina, and Tibet and its relentless program of infiltration and subversion in other Asian countries make it a serious threat to all the free peoples of Asia.

By stepping up the fighting in Indochina in an obvious attempt to influence the outcome of the Geneva Conference the Communists have shown the same callous disregard for the extravagant expenditure of Viet Minh lives as they showed for Chinese lives in Korea. The Chinese Communist regime disregarded the most elemental rules of prisoner-of-war treatment in Korea, committing unspeakable atrocities against United Nations troops. It has carried on a methodical "Hate America" campaign among its own people and has subjected American and other foreign nationals to all manner of indignity, has confiscated foreign property without compensation, and has often made it impossible for foreign business establishments either to carry on or to close down. It still holds 32 American civilians in prison, incommunicado, under intolerable physical conditions, without trial and without even a statement of charges. It has developed "brain

washing" to a fine science to secure useful, if false, confessions from prisoners and has even directed it against its own nationals to secure in recalcitrant cases the complete obedience and conformity which must characterize the "new socialist man." The regime has liquidated millions of its own citizens, by means ranging from outright murder to induced suicide, in its attacks on private businessmen and in the spurious land reform program which brought it early support from the unsuspecting peasants but which is now, as control of the land is taken over by the state, bringing it the mute and impotent hostility of the dispossessed farmers. There is not only no freedom of speech, press, or assembly; there is not even freedom of silence, since all must be vocal in their support of Communist policies.

The regime has set about painstakingly to change the whole fabric of traditional Chinese society. Through endless study groups it has attempted to reach every citizen, in the attempt to make his thoughts and acts conform to the supposed needs of the Party. These study groups involve lectures by Communist cadres, the reading of prescribed texts, and "discussion." The lectures invariably contain the "right" answers to the problem at hand, but hours and often even weeks are then spent in endless discussions which are preordained to end up right where they started: with the "right" answers. No segment of the population is excluded from the Communist program of remolding the individual. The soldier is given special attention, in this as in other matters. I have talked in Chinese with country boys in the Chinese Communist Army who could scarcely phrase a compound sentence on most subjects but who could hold forth by the hour with astounding facility on the subjects of dialectical materialism and the history of Western imperialism, Communist version.

Even the so-called educational institutions do not escape the heavy imprint of the political requirements regarded as the current specific for the ailments of the Communist state. Academic research, like religion, the economy, and the patterns of social behavior, is made the handmaiden of the Communist brand of politics. The family unit is a special target of the Communists. Children are trained to spy and report on their parents, and they not infrequently have denounced their parents in instances where they knew it meant the death of their parents. Finally, the regime, in order to gain sorely needed foreign exchange, has stooped to trade in narcotics and to blackmail of overseas Chinese whose relatives on the mainland are at its mercy.

In short, the Mao Tse-tung regime, whose cause is pled at Geneva by Chou En-lai, internally is a police state of the worst order and externally is a convicted aggressor, a continuing threat to its neighbors, and apparently an enemy of all na-

tions who do not choose to identify themselves completely with the camp of "peace-loving nations under the leadership of the Soviet Union." It is the Communists who insist that there is no third, middle, or neutral road. All who are not for them are considered to be against them. At least there can be no doubt as to where Communist China stands, and there should be no room left for wishful thinking on the subject. Mao Tse-tung, upon the inception of his regime on October 1, 1949, proclaimed his so-called "lean to one side policy," that is, toward the Soviet side. This bids fair to be the understatement of our time. Mao was less reserved when, upon the death of Stalin, he sent a telegram to Moscow declaring that Red China would stand by the Soviet Union "definitely, forever and with maximum resoluteness." This smacks more of prostration than of leaning.

Communist China, it is true, is not in the same impotent situation in the Communist orbit as are the Eastern European satellites. The very size, geographical location, and importance of China assure it a special status. We cannot read into this situation any significant element of divisiveness, however. The very fact of special status doubtless makes Communist China more comfortable in the Soviet camp than it would otherwise be. In time there may well be increasing frictions between the Chinese and Russians. Russia has traditionally had aggressive designs against China. Difficulties may well mount in time over Soviet influence in China's Northeast and Northwest, over control of the Communist movement in the rest of Asia, over Chinese disappointment at the limitations of Soviet aid commitments, and perhaps over alleged ideological heresies. For the foreseeable future, however, the affinities which bind the two powers together are likely to be much stronger than the divisive frictions.

Such is the nature of the regime which appears at Geneva to be making a bid for general recognition, for entry into the United Nations, and for freer trade with the West. The United States, for its part, cannot recognize this regime. We will continue vigorously to oppose its admission to any United Nations body as the representative of the Chinese people. And we cannot favor a relaxation of trade controls justly imposed against a convicted aggressor which has given no indication of having altered its aggressive course but on the contrary remains a constant threat to its neighbors and desires to build up its industrial base to support a war machine with the avowed purpose of "liberating" the rest of the world. We believe that to do so would, on the one hand, further confirm the Chinese Communists in their dedication to their present loyalties and courses of action and, on the other, tend to produce disillusionment and discouragement on the part of other Asian nations anxious to maintain their freedom and in many instances their newly won independence.

Continuing Recognition of Free China

There is another reason why we cannot accept the Peiping regime as representative of the Chinese people. We have no intention of turning our backs on the Republic of China on Formosa or of forsaking the 10 million Free Chinese on that Island to a fate of Communist tyranny. We believe that the Republic of China is far more representative of the will of the Chinese people than is the regime on the mainland. It continues to represent China in the United Nations ably, responsibly, and with dignity.

It is highly important that at this juncture, when attention is focused upon the Chinese Communist regime, primarily because of its outrageous conduct, we not forget the real and potential importance of the cause of Free China. There is abundant precedent for the free nations' continued recognition even of governments in exile, for considerations dictated by reason and principle, when those governments retain no territorial control or military potential. Free China, however, is a going and growing concern, which is developing in increasingly favorable contrast to the conditions of tyranny and oppression imposed on the mainland by its would-be successor regime. That it has yet failed fully to achieve, by its own ready admission, that standard of democratic excellence by which it is often judged is hardly surprising, considering the facts that it has had only 6 years of constitutional government, is in a period of acute national emergency, and with extremely limited national resources is called upon to support a disproportionately large military establishment and maintain the morale and loyalty of civil servants on a below-subsistence level of pay. Even with outside aid this is a large order. The surprising thing is that the Island is as stable as it is, that the economy, with its several weaknesses, is as strong as it is, that its military potential grows as it does, that morale both among the military and the civilian population is as high as it is, that the Island is as free from subversion as it is, and that in these troublous times there is as much freedom of the press, speech, and person as there is. I have lived in both Communist China and Free China, and I am unable to view the appellation "Free China" as any misnomer. It is deserving of free world support.

The United States will continue its military, economic, and political support of the Government of the Republic of China, and we will continue to support it as the representative of China in the United Nations. The Chinese Communists, in their extravagant propaganda, continue to speak of our "forceful occupation" of Formosa. This is preposterous, as all the world knows. Our advisers and technicians are there at the express invitation of the Government of China, to help it maintain its economic and political stability and to assist the Chinese to develop and maintain a military establishment capable of defending the

Island from Communist invasion and to make a greater contribution as an important part of the anti-Communist armed might in opposition to Communist aggression and expansion in the Pacific.

Such, in brief, is the problem and the promise presented to us by a divided China at this hour of grave crisis in Asian and world history. To meet this hour at Geneva and elsewhere with the degree of sober responsibility for which all men who treasure freedom look, requires all the reason, luteness, faith, wisdom, firmness, patience, and understanding which we can summon. It would be idle at this point to speculate upon the outcome of the important conference now being held at Geneva. The next few days may be decisive. But there can be little doubt that the issues with which we are concerned at Geneva provide another severe test of the very principle of collective security on which may rest the fate of hundreds of millions of Asians, and ultimately of us all.

• *Mr. Jenkins, author of the above article, is Officer in Charge of Political Affairs, Office of Chinese Affairs. His article is based on an address made before the Scarlet Key Honor Society of Boston University, Boston, Mass., on May 5.*

U. S. Policy on Participation in Collective Defense

Press release 284 dated May 25

At his news conference on May 25, a correspondent recalled to Secretary Dulles his report to the Nation following his return from Geneva¹ in which he set forth the conditions under which the United States intervened in Korea. Mr. Dulles was asked to relate those conditions to the Indochina situation. Mr. Dulles made the following reply:

I pointed out, I think, the existence of certain conditions in the case of Korea, and I went on to say that the situation in Indochina was different and more complex.

I think that broadly speaking the attitude of the United States toward this situation has been made clear by statements which the President has made and which I have made. I think it is fair to say that the United States attitude in this matter has been one of the few stable aspects in an otherwise changing and fluid situation.

The position of the United States toward collective security in Southeast Asia has been known basically for quite a long while. In fact, it really goes back to the time when I went out to the Far East in, I think, January of 1951 on a mission to

¹ BULLETIN of May 17, 1954, p. 739.

make a collective security pact in that area. That effort failed at that time in the sense that we were not able to put together a collective security arrangement of any large proportions, and we ended with a series of separate pacts—one with Japan, one with Australia and New Zealand, and another with the Philippines. But there was not a regional security pact created at that time.

Then I think I pointed out that, in his great address of April 16 of last year, President Eisenhower made a statement which did not attract at the time the attention it deserved perhaps because of other aspects of his speech where he referred to Korea and Southeast Asia and said there should be united action for the defense of Southeast Asia.

I repeated that statement in my March 29 speech² after having previously discussed it with congressional leaders and with our principal allies.

The general conditions under which the United States is prepared to participate in collective defense there or elsewhere, for that matter, are quite well known. We are willing to participate in collective defense basically upon the terms that are laid down by the Vandenberg Resolution of June 1948, which laid down basic conditions under which the United States would be prepared to participate on the basis of mutuality and in accordance with the principles of the United Nations.

We are not prepared to go in for a defense of colonialism. We are only going to go in for defense of liberty and independence and freedom.

We don't go in alone; we go in where the other nations which have an important stake in the area recognize the peril as we do.

We go in where the United Nations gives moral sanction to our action.

All of those conditions are known. They have been known. They are a basic part of American foreign policy, and they are, as the President said in one of his press conferences, a "stable" element in the situation.

Mr. Dulles was then asked what was initiated by this Government in the period between March or April of 1953 and May of this year to bring about a Southeast Asian pact. He replied:

We did have conversations, particularly with the French and the representatives of the Associated States who under conditions then existing were apt to form the core of any defensive action in that area.

A correspondent recalled that one of the conditions laid down by Mr. Dulles in his speech of May 7 was to give independence to the Associated States. The correspondent said that France and Viet-Nam had initialed proposed treaties of independence and association. He asked Mr. Dulles

how far those treaties go toward meeting this point. Mr. Dulles made the following reply:

I think what France is doing will, from what you might call a juridical standpoint, be a very large step in fulfillment of their pledge of July 3 of last year of complete independence to the Associated States. The main difficulty, I would say, at the present moment is not so much juridical as it is the translation of legal documents into a sense on the part of the peoples of Viet-Nam, Laos, and Cambodia that they really have an independence for which it is worthwhile for them to fight and, if need be, to die.

It takes time to translate papers that are signed in Paris into the living spirit; and it also takes time to overcome a certain feeling on the part of many of the Asian nations that France is not really sincere in its promises. I believe the French are going a long way down that path—perhaps from a legal standpoint as far as it is either wise or necessary to go at the present time. But it is one thing to have the letter and another thing to have the spirit, and I would say at the moment the principal deficiency is a translation of the spirit of liberty into the area and in the conduct of the French people in relation to the native peoples. There is quite a bit to be done, I think, in that practical respect.

A reporter cited as one of the general conditions for participation a place where the United Nations gives moral sanction. He asked if the United States had any plans for seeking that kind of sanction from the United Nations. Mr. Dulles answered:

There have been discussions off and on, I am sorry to say more off than on, over the past year or more with reference to bringing the United Nations into this situation. At the moment the prospects look somewhat better than they have recently, but in the past we have been very close to the United Nations action without its being actually taken. So I don't want to forecast at the present time.

Asked if we would support any appeal to the United Nations for a peace mission or observation mission to be sent into the Southeast Asian area, he replied:

I believe if such an appeal were made, the United States would support it.

Mr. Dulles was asked if the United States had before it any request from the French Government for intervention in Indochina. He replied:

No, the French Government has made no such request of the United States. They have had some conversations to explore the conditions under which that might be possible, and in that respect the French have been told much the same thing

² Ibid., Apr. 12, 1954, p. 539.

that has been publicly said by the President and me as to the conditions, which as I say have been stable and unchanging over a considerable period of time, under which such intervention would be considered possible. Of course, let me make clear that one of the conditions which we have always stood on is that there must be congressional sanction to any such action.

Five-Power Military Talks

Press release 283 dated May 25

Asked at his news conference on May 25 if he could comment on reported plans to hold five-power military staff talks in Washington, Secretary Dulles made the following reply:

There have been going on a number of discussions with a number of countries with relation both to the political aspects and in regard to the military aspects of a possible collective action in

relation to Southeast Asia. On the military side there have been plans for consultations both in relation to Thailand, where their military position is being reviewed, and Secretary Wilson is in Manila and is having conversations there with the Philippine Government with respect to its military positions. Some of his military advisers are there with him.

There have been some suggestions about discussions between the three ANZUS powers, that is, Australia, the United States, and New Zealand, and also bringing in the United Kingdom and France. There has been no final decision on the matter as yet, but conversations as to that possibility are being considered. I want to emphasize, however, that these military talks are in no sense in substitution for political conversations which are continuing to go on. Nor are these five-power military talks, if they take place, in any sense exclusive. As I emphasized, there are also similar talks either going on or in contemplation with Thailand and the Philippines.

The Growth of Freedom in India

*by George V. Allen
Ambassador to India¹*

India was a faraway land, relatively unknown to most Americans, until World War II, when thousands of American G. I.'s went there and served there because it was next door to Burma, which was occupied by the Japanese. Before the War it was known by American missionaries intimately, and by a few American businessmen, and many of us had learned something about India because of the prominence of Mahatma Gandhi and his first lieutenant, Jawaharlal Nehru, who were the leaders of India's struggle for independence. The United States had consular representatives in India more than a hundred years ago, but it has really been only since the war that India has loomed very large in American thinking.

Today, India is the largest democracy in the world, with more than 360 million people. Today, India is an independent republic with a constitution which has many features similar to our

own—particularly our Bill of Rights. Mahatma Gandhi has passed on, but Mr. Nehru is India's Prime Minister, and he is still working to achieve the benefits for his country that India considers its due as a sovereign nation. That India is independent is not doubted by us or by any Indian except perhaps by the Communists in India and elsewhere who profess to believe, curiously, that independence is real only if a country's internal and foreign policies are the same as those of the Soviet Union. Certainly we Americans are aware of Indian independence. But Indians and Americans alike are often puzzled by the fact that our two countries have recently differed sharply over foreign affairs.

Indians are puzzled because they consider that they are exercising their right to independent views—exercising that independence—which the United States has always supported. They recall that America supported India's independence movement, not in a material way, but in a moral and political way. Our stock was very high in India when it achieved independence in 1947 be-

¹ Excerpts from an address made over the radio network of the Columbia Broadcasting System on May 16 (press release 258 dated May 15).

ary since Indians knew that the United States was the first nation to fight and win independence in modern history. The writings of Washington, Jefferson, Paine, and Lincoln were very familiar to them. They also knew that the United States Government had urged Britain to grant self-government to India. I wish to return to this matter of foreign policy differences with India in a moment.

that Secretary of State Dulles asked me to come back to Washington from New Delhi to help answer the questions which our representatives in the Congress are asking as they consider the administration's budget requests.² Among the requests which President Eisenhower has proposed is an appropriation for military and economic assistance to foreign countries. The President has proposed that the United States Congress appropriate a total of \$104,500,000 for economic and technical assistance to India.

on with I thought I might tell you what I have been saying to your Senators and Congressmen, many of whom I have come to know as friends during my career of 25 years as a Foreign Service officer. Your representatives in Washington want to know why the United States should continue to give economic assistance to India.

Over the last few weeks the attention of all of us has been turned very much toward Asia, particularly the long peninsula of Southeast Asia. Thus we have come to understand the stakes for the free world in the tremendous and vital struggle that has been taking place in Indochina. India has achieved a stable political status which, if duplicated in Indochina, would cause a large part of the world's worries about the latter country to vanish. Striking proof of India's success in democracy was the national elections held over 2 years ago when 107 million people voted in an atmosphere of peace and freedom. Thus, it is surely a matter of the greatest importance to us that India should continue to succeed in the most enormous experiment in democracy the world has ever seen.

A Test of Two Opposed Systems

In Asia today two huge nations are testing two opposed systems to see which can bring its people the greatest spiritual and material benefits in the shortest time. On the Chinese mainland, Communist totalitarianism gripping the Chinese people in an iron vise is attempting to achieve rapid material gain by ruthless methods which sacrifice every human and spiritual value. In India, 360 million people, under the leadership of a government chosen by their own votes, are

attempting to achieve similar material goals through democratic methods which respect the political, religious, and social rights of the individual. The relative degree of success achieved by these two systems may well determine the future of Asia.

This is not to say, of course, that a state of democratic perfection has been achieved in India, and few Indians would try to make such a claim. But democracy has put down solid roots, democratic habits are becoming stronger, while great progress has been made in driving back old social evils that formerly retarded India's economic and political development.

Indians are justly and understandably proud of the rapid and successful transition they have made from colonial status to independent nationhood but this has not blinded them to the overwhelming character of their economic tasks. Rather Indian leaders, from Nehru on down, are acutely aware that their hard-won political rights cannot survive for long without real economic progress, progress for the masses of India long submerged in hopeless poverty but now emerging to demand more and better food, clothing, and housing. The people of India are attacking the causes of Indian poverty with imagination and boldness. The Government's Five Year Plan of economic development is a well-thought-out, mature program which tackles India's most pressing economic difficulty—her shortages in food-grains—while at the same time laying the foundations for the widespread industrial growth which must evolve if India is to make real progress. This plan is not one for the socialization of India. Although the state plays an important part, great dependence is placed on speedy expansion of private industry.

Perhaps the most important part of the plan is the so-called community-development program whose aim is to improve the overall productivity of the Indian village where over 80 percent of India's people live. This is being done primarily through simple improvements in the cultivation methods of the Indian farmer but also by improving village handicrafts, health conditions, and communications. Most important of all, this whole process is bringing about a real awakening of the Indian villager from generations of inertia and indifference.

Ninety percent of this effort is entirely Indian but I think Americans can take justifiable pride in the fact that we have made a real contribution in men and money to the measurable economic progress made by the Indian people since achieving their independence. In recent years American county agents have gone out into Indian villages to advise on plowing, planting, and the use of improved seeds. American health experts have assisted in the hard struggle against malaria, the greatest killer and disabler. American dollars

²For the text of a statement on economic assistance to India made by Ambassador Allen before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, on May 4, see BULLETIN of May 17, 1954, p. 759.

have made possible the drilling of hundreds of deep wells whose waters have raised the productivity of parched acres. India has used effectively the aid we have given and can usefully absorb the aid provided for in the 1955 program.

In India democracy faces its most important trial—unless it succeeds there we cannot expect democracy to command the respect of other Asian peoples. Further economic assistance to India is clearly in our national interest. We are not trying to put out a fire in India. But we are taking constructive fire preventive measures. We are not waiting until the country is in immediate peril before taking an interest in it.

Our desire to encourage the growth of economic and political freedom in India is an important reason for continuing our aid but there are other compelling reasons. Our economic aid to India provides solid testimony to the nations of Asia that this country is aware of the need to remove the conditions which encourage the growth of communism in addition to simply being willing to strengthen armed resistance to communism whenever it threatens aggression.

Distrust of Western Motives

Unfortunately, as part of the aftermath of western colonialism in Asia, the Asian peoples are still distrustful of the methods and motives of ourselves and our allies. The Communists play skillfully on the suspicion that any move we make to strengthen the forces of freedom through military means is in reality aimed at establishing a new, American imperialism in Asia. Our economic and technical assistance programs in India provide tangible proof that our policy is not one of exploitation but rather one of enlightened self-interest striking at poverty and ignorance, which are the basic causes of aggression and chaos, and that we have not decided that there are only military solutions to Asian problems.

I am not ashamed to say that I think aid to India should be given in part on purely humanitarian grounds. Within the limits of our own national economic health, it is good for the world and for our own souls to assist in raising the economic level of nations poorer than we are. We need not be afraid of being called do-gooders when we are acting in keeping with our own highest national traditions.

A recent source of friction between India and the United States was our recent decision, in response to Pakistan's request, to give military as-

sistance to Pakistan.³ This decision was taken to help Pakistan become a stronger member of the community of free nations who are determined to resist Communist aggression. Between India and Pakistan there are still a number of important unsolved disputes and our decision to aid Pakistan militarily was greeted with a great deal of uneasiness in India since it was feared this aid might be used against India. President Eisenhower, in his announcement and in his letter on the subject to Prime Minister Nehru, made it absolutely clear that the arms we would give could in no way be used in aggression without his taking appropriate action in accordance with his constitutional authority. Our decision to help Pakistan with military equipment heightens the need for strengthening our ties with India.

However, India has proved its willingness to lend a hand in settling vexing international disputes. In Korea, India assumed the difficult task of acting as custodian for those prisoners of war from each side who did not wish to return to their homelands. President Eisenhower sent his personal congratulations to Prime Minister Nehru on the fine job done by the Indian forces in Korea.

I believe too that in this country there are some common misconceptions about the attitude of India and its leaders toward communism. The Communists are an active political party in India today but they have not been so successful there as they have been in some other foreign countries. The party remains a determined minority group, eager and clever at capitalizing on any failures or shortcomings of the present democratic government of Prime Minister Nehru. However, Mr. Nehru and the Congress Party which he heads are strongly anti-Communist. They have not hesitated to suppress vigorously Communist violence. They find frequent opportunity to point out to the Indian people that communism is a foreign ideology controlled and manipulated by foreigners in a foreign land—Russia.

Last year Congress enacted a substantial aid program for India. I do not believe that any events of the past year have altered materially the factors which led us to decide to give this aid. An independent India is still an important source of strength to the free world. I hope deeply that the work we have started in India can go on and that the Congress will enact the President's proposals for continuing to help India with technical assistance and a certain amount of basic economic aid. . . .

³ *Ibid.*, Mar. 15, 1954, p. 400.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Mar. 1, 1954, p. 334.

Ethiopia's Role in World Affairs

Following are the texts of (1) an address by Haile Selassie I, Emperor of Ethiopia, made before a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives on May 28, and (2) statements made by President Eisenhower and Emperor Haile Selassie at the state dinner given at the White House on May 26 in the Emperor's honor:

ADDRESS BY HAILE SELASSIE I¹

I count it a privilege to address what is one of the greatest parliaments in the world today—where the forces that make great one of the most powerful of nations have been and are being brought to bear and where issues of worldwide importance have been decided.

The extent of that power and influence and the rapidity with which you have reached such a summit of importance for the rest of the world are unparalleled in world history and beggar all conceivable comparisons. Two hundred years ago today, as I am speaking, Gen. George Washington won the battle of Fort Mifflin, a victory which was but a step in the gradual forging together of the United States. What a phenomenal progress has been made in that interval of 200 years, an interval which—you may pardon me as representative of one of the most ancient nations in the world—is surely but a surprisingly short passage of time.²

So great are your power and wealth that the budget of a single American city often equals that of an entire nation.

As in the case of other countries, you gave us lend-lease assistance during the war and, at present, both mutual security and technical assistance. Yet, so vast are your power and resources that even after deducting all expenses of the Federal Government, you have met the costs of this

assistance in one quarter of an hour—15 minutes—of your annual production.

Of what interest is it to you then, you may well ask, that I, the head of what must be for you a small and remote country, should appear before you in the midst of your deliberations? I do not take it upon myself to point out why Ethiopia is important to the United States—that you can best judge for yourselves, but, rather, to explain to you with brevity, the circumstances which make Ethiopia a significant factor in world politics. Since so much of world politics is, today, influenced by the decisions which you, Members of Congress, reach, here in these halls, it is, perhaps, not unimportant that I set out these considerations for you.

A moment ago, I remarked that, for you, Ethiopia must appear to be a small and remote country. Of course, both of these terms are purely relative. In fact, so far as size is concerned, Ethiopia has exactly the area and population of your entire Pacific far west consisting of the States of California, Oregon, Washington, and also Idaho. We are remote, perhaps, only in the sense that we enjoy a secure position on the high plateau of East Africa protected by the Red Sea and our mountain fastnesses. However, by the numerous airlines that link us with the rest of the world, it is possible to arrive in Washington from Addis Ababa in less than 2 days.

By one of those strange parallels of history, Ethiopia and a certain well-known country of the Far East who both enjoy highly defensible and strategic positions in their respective areas of the world, both for similar reasons, simultaneously, at the beginning of the 17th century, entered upon a 200-year period of isolation. As in the case of the other country, that isolation came to an end in the latter half of the 19th century, with this difference that, upon abandoning her policy of isolation, Ethiopia was immediately called upon to defend against tremendous odds her thousand-year-old independence. Indeed, so bitter has been this struggle against foreign aggrandizement that were it not for our persistence and for the enormous social, economic, and material advances that Ethiopia has made in the interval, and particularly since the close of the last war,

¹Reprinted from the *Cong. Rec.* of May 28, 1954, p. 6045.

²After reading the first two paragraphs in English, Emperor Haile Selassie delivered the remainder of his address in the Amharic language.

Ethiopia might very well have returned to her policy of isolation.

Ethiopia a New Frontier

In consequence, in many respects, and particularly since the last World War, Ethiopia has become a new frontier of widely expanding opportunities, notwithstanding the tremendous setback which we suffered in the unprovoked invasion of our country 19 years ago and the long years of unaided struggle against an infinitely stronger enemy. The last 7 years have seen the quadrupling of our foreign trade, currency, and foreign-exchange holdings. Holdings of American dollars have increased 10 times over. The Ethiopian dollar has become the only United States dollar-based currency in the Middle East today. The assets of our national bank of issue have increased 1,000 percent. Blessed with what is perhaps the most fertile soil in Africa, well-watered, and with a wide variety of climates ranging from the temperate on the plateau, to the tropical in the valleys, Ethiopia can grow throughout the year crops, normally raised only in widely separated areas of the earth's surface. Since the war, Ethiopia has become the granary of the Middle East, as well as the only exporter of meat, cereals, and vegetables. Whereas at the end of the war, every educational facility had been destroyed, today, schools are springing up throughout the land, the enrollment has quadrupled and, as in the pioneer days in the United States, and indeed, I presume, as in the lives of many of the distinguished Members of Congress here present, schoolchildren, in their zeal for education, take all sorts of work in order to earn money to purchase textbooks and to pursue their education.

Finally, through the return in 1952 of its historic ports on the Red Sea and of the long-lost territory of Eritrea, Ethiopia has not only regained access to the sea, but has been one of the few states in the postwar world to have regained lost territory pursuant to postwar treaties and in application of peaceful methods.

We have thus become a land of expanding opportunities where the American pioneering spirit, ingenuity and technical abilities have been and will continue to be welcomed.

A thousand year old history of struggles to defend the territorial integrity of our country, the long fight for liberation two decades ago and the recent campaign in Korea have given our army an esprit de corps and a fighting spirit that, I believe, can stand, without misgiving, for comparison. Today, our fighting forces are among the largest and best trained in the Middle East.

The struggle for liberation served to strengthen the forces of national consciousness and unity and since that time we have made significant advances in social progress. Unlike many other countries, Ethiopia has long been a nation of small, rather

than of large, landowners. Moreover, a profoundly democratic tradition has assured in the past, as it assures today, the rise to the highest posts of responsibility in the Government, of men of the humblest of origins.

It is but natural, therefore, that a state which has existed for 3,000 years, which has regained its independence by the blood of its patriots, which commands the allegiance and loyalty of even its most lowly subjects, and which enjoys an unusually sound economy, should have a regime of marked stability on that area of the world where stability is so frequently absent today.

Position in World Politics

Such is the state of Ethiopia today about which I am speaking. It is against this background that I wish to talk to you of Ethiopia as a factor in world politics. Her geographic location is of great significance, with her long shore line and its archipelago of hundreds of islands. Ethiopia occupies a unique position on the most constricted but important of strategic lines of communications in the world, that which passes through the Red Sea. She also lies on the other most strategic line of communication in the world, namely, the world band of telecommunications which, because of natural phenomena, circles the world at the Equator.

However, in yet a perhaps broader sense is Ethiopia's geographical position of significance. Through her location on the shores of the Red Sea and in the horn of East Africa, Ethiopia has profound historical ties with the rest of the Middle East as well as with Africa. In this respect she stands in a completely unique position. Her culture and social structure were founded in the mingling of her original culture and civilization with the Hamitic and Semitic migrations into Africa from the Arabian Peninsula, and, in fact, today, our language, Amharic, is a member of that large family of Hamitic and Semitic tongues and, therefore, intimately related to Hebrew and Arabic. Indeed, at one time Ethiopia extended to both sides of the Red Sea as well as north to upper Egypt. It was, therefore, not without reason that, during the Middle Ages the Emperor was known as "he who maintains order between the Christians and the Moslems." A profound comprehension of and sympathy with the other states of the Middle East naturally inspires Ethiopian national policies.

On the other hand, 3,000 years of history make of Ethiopia a profoundly African state in all that term implies. In the United Nations, she has been to the forefront in the defense of Africa's racial, economic, and social interests.

Finally, both culturally and geographically, Ethiopia serves to a unique degree as the link between the Middle East and Africa. Situated in the horn of Africa, and along the shores of the Red Sea, with the desert area of Africa to

the north and west, it is but natural that Ethiopia should be the filter through which the ideas and influences of the continent of Africa should pass to the East and vice versa.

Thus, our social and political outlook and orientation became important not only in terms of Middle Eastern and African but also, in terms of world politics—and this leads me to point to a factor which I consider to be of unique significance. We have a profound orientation toward the West. One consideration alone, although there are others, would suffice to explain this result. The two Americas and the continent of Europe together constitute exactly one-third of the land masses of the world. It is in this one-third that are concentrated the peoples of the Christian faith. With but rare exceptions Christianity does not extend beyond the confines of the Mediterranean. Here, I find it significant that, in point of fact, in this remaining two-thirds of the earth's surface, Ethiopia is the state having the largest Christian population and is by far the largest Christian state in the Middle East. In fact, Ethiopia is unique among the nations of the world in that it is, today, the one remaining Christian state that can trace her history unbroken as a Christian polity from the days when the Roman Empire itself was still a vigorous reality.

The strength of the Christian tradition has been of vital significance in our national history, and as a force for the unification of the Empire of Ethiopia. It is this force which gives us, among the other countries of the Middle East, a profound orientation toward the West. We read the same Bible. We speak a common spiritual language.

It is this heritage of ideals and principles that has excluded from our conscious, indeed, from our unconscious processes, the possibility of compromising with those principles which we hold sacred. We have sought to remain faithful to the principle of respect for the rights of others, and the right of each people to an independent existence. We, like you, are profoundly opposed to the un-Christian use of force and are, as you, attached to a concept of the pacific settlement of disputes. Our lone struggle before the outbreak of the last world catastrophe as, indeed, our recent participation in the combined efforts and the glorious comradeship in arms in Korea have marked us, like you, in giving more than lipservice to these ideals. It is your deep comprehension of our ideals and struggles in which it has been my privilege to lead, at times not without heartbreak, my beloved people, and our common comradeship in arms that have laid a very sure and lasting basis for friendship between a great and a small country.

U.S.-Ethiopian Commercial Relations

Last year, we concluded with you a new treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation de-

signed to assure to American business enterprise expanded opportunities in Ethiopia. Our dollar-based currency is also there to assure the ready return to the United States of the profits of their investments. We have entrusted to American enterprise the development of our civil aviation which has surpassed all expectations. To American enterprise we have confided the exploitation of our oil resources as well as of our gold deposits. Although my country is 8,000 miles removed from the eastern seaboard of the United States, United States exports to Ethiopia have, notwithstanding this heavy handicap, pushed forward to the forefront in Ethiopia.

Conversely, the United States stands in first rank of countries to whom we export. Ethiopia which has, from the Province of Kaffa, given the world the name and product of coffee, produces on her high plateau one of the finest mocha coffees in the world. The coffee which you drink attains its unique and pleasant American flavor in part, at least, through the added mixture of Ethiopian coffee. American shoes are made, in part at least, from Ethiopian goatskins which are principally exported to the United States.

On the other hand, you have given us valuable support, not only in lend-lease assistance during the war, and today through mutual-security and technical-assistance agreements, but you have also powerfully aided us in obtaining rectification of long-standing injustices. If, today, the brothers of Ethiopia stand finally united under the Crown and if Ethiopia has regained her shoreline on the Red Sea, it has been due, in no small measure to the contribution of the United States of America. I am happy to take this occasion to express to you, the Congress, which has approved this assistance, the sincere and lasting appreciation of my people.

Defense of Collective Security

This collaboration with the West and with the United States in particular has taken yet broader forms. There is our military collaboration based on the mutual-security program. If we leave aside Greece and Turkey as belonging to the North Atlantic group, Ethiopia has been the only state of the Middle East to follow the example of the United States in sending forces to Korea for the defense of collective security.

In so doing, Ethiopia has been inspired by a vision which is broader than her preoccupation with regional policies or advantages. Nearly two decades ago, I personally assumed before history the responsibility of placing the fate of my beloved people on the issue of collective security, for surely, at that time and for the first time in world history, that issue was posed in all its clarity. My searchings of conscience convinced me of the rightness of my course and if, after untold sufferings and, indeed, unaided resistance at the

time of aggression, we now see the final vindication of that principle in our joint action in Korea, I can only be thankful that God gave me strength to persist in our faith until the moment of its recent glorious vindication.

We do not view this principle as an extenuation for failing to defend one's homeland to the last drop of one's blood, and, indeed, our own struggles during the last two decades bear testimony to our conviction that in matters of collective security as of Providence, "God helps him who helps himself." However, we feel that nowhere can the call for aid against aggression be refused by any state, large or small. It is either a universal principle or it is no principle at all. It cannot admit of regional application or be of regional responsibility. That is why we, like you, have sent troops halfway around the world to Korea. We must face that responsibility for its application wherever it may arise in these troubled hours of world history. Faithful to her traditions and outlook and to the sacred memory of her patriots who fell in Ethiopia and in Korea in defense of that principle, Ethiopia cannot do otherwise.

The world has ceaselessly sought for and striven to apply some system for assuring the peace of the world. Many solutions have been proposed and many have failed. Today the system which we have advocated and with which the name of Ethiopia is inseparably associated has, after her sacrifices of two decades ago, and her recent sacrifices with the United States and others in Korea, finally demonstrated its worth. However, no system, not even that of collective security, can succeed unless there is not only a firm determination to apply it universally both in space and time, but also whatever be the cost. Having successfully applied the system of collective security in Korea, we must now, wherever in the world the peace is threatened, pursue its application more resolutely than ever and with courageous acceptance of its burdens. We have the sacred duty to our children to spare them the sacrifices which we have known. I call upon the world for determination fearlessly to apply and to accept—as you and as we have accepted them—the sacrifices of collective security.

It is here that our common Christian heritage unites two peoples across the globe in a community of ideals and endeavor. Ethiopia seeks only to affirm and broaden that cooperation between peace-loving nations.

TEXTS OF TOASTS

President Eisenhower

YOUR MAJESTY, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: During the past century and a half, there have been entertained within these walls many individuals

of distinction—some of our own country, some visiting us from abroad. I think it is safe to say that never has any company here gathered been honored by the presence in their guest of honor of an individual more noted for his fierce defense of freedom and for his courage in defending the independence of his people than the guest of honor this evening.

I read once that no individual can really be known to have greatness until he has been tested in adversity. By this test, our guest of honor has established new standards in the world. In 5 years of adversity, with his country overrun but never conquered, he never lost for one single second his dignity. He never lost his faith in himself, in his people, and in his God.

I deem it a very great privilege, ladies and gentlemen, to ask you to rise and with me to drink a toast to His Imperial Majesty, the Emperor of Ethiopia.

Halle Selassie I

I thank you, Mr. President, for the kind sentiments which you have expressed on this occasion, because I take them, not as addressed to me, but to my beloved people.

I have accepted your kind invitation, Mr. President, to come to the United States and visit your nation, because it has offered me the occasion to express the depth of my appreciation and that of my people for your friendship and assistance which encouraged and aided us in resuming our march on the road of progress from which we had been detained by the imperatives of war. That assistance is today, in yet more varied forms, strongly impelling us forward on the path of progressive development.

By your great comprehension of the problems with which Ethiopia is faced, it has been possible for us to achieve, with your help, considerable progress in the solution of the present hour. The smoothness of this collaboration, notwithstanding the barriers of distance and language, and the breadth and richness of our relations attained during the half-century to which you, Mr. President, have alluded, constitute the supreme manifestation of that extraordinary flexibility of understanding and felicity of spirit with which you, as a nation, have been endowed, and of the trust and confidence which you inspire in the minds of others.

I raise my glass to the men and women of the great and noble American nation, and to its heroic and distinguished chief, President Eisenhower, and, last but not least, to his consort and wife, who so charmingly represents in her person the women of the United States and the role which they play in giving leadership to American thoughts and ideals throughout the world.

Visit of Haile Selassie I

News Conference Statement by Secretary Dulles

Press release 280 dated May 25

The Emperor of Ethiopia, Haile Selassie I, has arrived in this country and is expected here in Washington tomorrow. We welcome his arrival here very much.

Ethiopia is the oldest independent country in Africa and it has been a Christian nation since the fourth century. The United States has had diplomatic relations with Ethiopia for over 50 years. The Emperor of Ethiopia has demonstrated since the earliest days of his reign the highest devotion to the principles of collective security. Ethiopia has been a steadfast supporter of the United Nations and the Emperor's countrymen have been among the most courageous of our comrades-in-arms in Korea. I am confident that the American people will extend their heartiest welcome to the

Emperor, whom we have long respected and admired and whose people we count on as friends and allies.

Registration of Base Agreement With Ethiopia

Press release 289 dated May 28

The Secretary of State and His Excellency the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Ethiopia, Ato Aklilou Abte Wold, today announced that the United States was presenting for formal registration with the Secretariat of the United Nations an agreement concluded in 1953 between the Ethiopian and United States Governments concerning the utilization of defense installations within the Empire of Ethiopia. The only United States military installation involved is the United States Army radio station at Asmara in Eritrea which began operating during the Second World War.

Technical Cooperation and the American Heritage

by Harold E. Stassen

Director, Foreign Operations Administration¹

Before I begin this brief discussion of our technical cooperation programs, I should like to express my genuine admiration for the outstanding support that you have given these programs from the pulpits of your churches.

There has been submitted for the consideration of the Congress a technical cooperation program for the coming year of \$131.6 million. This is an increase of more than \$24 million over the sum that was appropriated for the present year's activities.

As the ancient and time-tested enemy of oppression and the undaunted champion of brotherhood among all men, the religious leadership of America has played a decisive role in gathering the enthusiastic support of the American people for expanded programs of technical cooperation.

These programs are more than a reflection of the highest American humanitarianism; their concept springs from the moral and ethical obligations of man to his fellow men, which are the strength and foundation of Christian tradition.

In this respect it is highly fitting that technical cooperation should be part of a positive American foreign policy; for foreign policy has identical origins with our everyday lives—the religious principles and the democratic precepts which are the wellsprings of the practical idealism that has made America great.

There are as many paths to progress as there are nations and peoples. Technical cooperation programs seek to explore these paths, to exchange ideas and methods, theories and practices, and, by this fusion of mankind's accumulated knowledge and experience, to find the best ways to lay the building blocks for a better world of tomorrow.

¹Address made before the Ministerial Union of Washington, Washington, D.C., on May 24.

Qualified Technicians Are Hard To Find

At the present time there are more than 1,800 U.S. technicians serving in 42 countries of the world. This is the largest number of technicians America has ever sent overseas; yet the number is not sufficient to meet our goals. The Foreign Operations Administration would like to increase this number to 2,500 by the end of 1954.

These technicians are not easy to find. They must have a high degree of technical competence in their special fields. But more than that, they must also possess a rare understanding and an ability to work with many peoples of different cultures and creeds.

An American agricultural agent will rarely explain a new concept over a conference table covered with geographical charts. More often he must leave the confines of his office and his home and go out into the fields with the farmers.

The public health nurse might practice her profession in a community health center. Yet frequently she will be found riding for many long hours in an open jeep, over bumpy, dusty roads, to remote villages out of reach of the health center.

The rewards for these technicians are not financially great, but there is a supreme satisfaction in knowing that yesterday a child afflicted with measles would develop pneumonia and die and that today a local nurse, trained through cooperative health programs, will administer penicillin and save that child's life.

If, in your sermons and your close contact with your congregations, you would salute these courageous and spirited Americans, you would not only be giving them the recognition and honor they so rightfully deserve but at the same time you would encourage qualified Americans to respond to this calling.

Effectiveness of Programs

I am often asked, "How can the effectiveness of these programs be measured?" Sometimes we are able to count the results in increased agricultural production or in the elimination of widespread disease or in rising attendance at a newly finished village school. However, these statistics are often difficult to obtain. We are working in areas where even simple population figures are frequently unavailable.

Yet, from another viewpoint, there has been clearly noted a new spirit, an intense desire to move ahead instead of backward. For example, some months back in the town of Grecia in Costa Rica a group of citizens entered the headquarters of the joint technical cooperation mission. They inquired if they could see the farm extension agent. The word had gotten around to them that this man could do things for their land that were nothing short of a miracle. They were told that

there were not sufficient funds to send him to their village. Sadly the people of Grecia returned to their homes.

But the desire had been planted and could not be easily suppressed. By popular subscriptions, by passing the hat, they raised enough money to pay the salary and expenses for their own agricultural specialists. Recently the valiant little town held its first public exposition of the results. The President of Costa Rica, the American Ambassador and some of our FOA people attended the fair. It would find it difficult to measure, in terms of statistics, the local pride and overwhelming self-confidence that these people have generated in themselves through their own efforts.

There is the most profound indication of the great impact of these programs in the moving stories that are reported from the field. In helping people to help themselves, it is not enough that they be furnished the tools with which they might build a better life; there must be instilled an inner initiative, an abiding spirit that springs from within.

One such story was recently reported to me from our mission in Ethiopia. In the city of Jimma the joint technical cooperation program has established an agricultural school under the guidance of the Oklahoma A & M College. One day last fall a very bedraggled and tired looking boy walked into the school. He had traveled more than 800 miles, mostly on foot, just to apply for admission. He hadn't eaten for 2 days and was obviously weak from hunger and exhaustion. He was put in a hospital for a week, and when he was well he took the entrance examination. He achieved a passing grade and at this moment is pursuing his studies. This kind of courage, this kind of initiative and determination, can surmount any barriers.

Fonds Parisien is a little hamlet on the road to Malpasse in Haiti. In 1947 Fonds Parisien was a dying community, dying from lack of water and impoverished soil. Those villagers who resisted the urge to move on were forced to live on "catie" seeds and to cut off twigs and branches for charcoal production as their only livelihood.

Fonds Parisien is a different place now. Arid lands have been scientifically cultivated. Brushland has been planted with rice, corn, beans, and vegetables. As farmer Toussaint Exaus put it, "My grandmother died here from starvation. Before the irrigation came, I was forced to dress in tatters. Now I have two new pairs of pants with several fine shirts. By our standards I am a wealthy man."

I do not believe any appreciation can equal that which was shown by a young father in Iran. He arrived one day at the joint public health service beaming with joy. Happily he reported that at last a son had been born and had lived. Nine previous children had died. The proud father was

congratulated and was asked what he had named his young son. His answer was, "I named him Point 4."

Importance of the Individual to Technical Cooperation

These heartwarming stories are a vivid expression of both the political and religious heritage of America. Our people are deeply concerned with the individual. Our youth strive to emulate great men. The spotlight has always been focused upon individual accomplishments and individual aspirations.

Our Bill of Rights guards the minority from the abuses of the majority and protects the opportunity for the individual citizen to achieve his potential economically, politically, and spiritually. From another viewpoint that same spirit is part of our religious heritage. We gage the achievements of these programs with a clear recognition of the inherent value of the individual man.

Out of past experiences there have been developed in recent months new trends in our technical cooperation programs. In planning these activities, we have made far greater use of colleges, universities, professional societies, and cultural groups. These resources enable us to tap broader sources of knowledge and experience to implement the programs.

There are now 35 college contracts under the technical cooperation programs, and the Foreign Operations Administration has agreements with 113 professional societies and commercial organizations to provide specific technical services abroad.

There has been an encouraging increase in projects carried out in cooperation with voluntary agencies, both of a religious and secular character. These church and lay groups play a highly significant role in technical cooperation. Because of the very nature of their organization, voluntary agencies are free to experiment and in a very large way to pioneer in technical cooperation work. They can undertake pilot projects which yield many valuable experiences which are later applied to full-scale technical cooperation activities. Moreover, it is often easier for these voluntary groups to get down to the level of the individual, where the most effective gains can be made.

Results vs. Costs

The total United States budget for technical cooperation, including the U.S. contributions to the multilateral activities of the United Nations, amounts to about 10 cents a month for each U.S. adult citizen.

I am firmly convinced that this is a small sum when compared to the achievements of these activities.

They are of necessity long-range programs. They are a product of a continuing and living experience. They are based upon the individual dignity of man and a deep-rooted belief that, given the opportunity, all men can supplant futility, fear, and poverty with faith, freedom, and progress.

A year ago President Eisenhower urged:

... the dedication of the energies, the resources, and the imaginations of all peaceful nations to a new kind of war. This would be a declared total war, not upon any human enemy but upon the brute forces of poverty and need.

The peace we seek, founded upon decent trust and cooperative effort among nations, can be fortified, not by weapons of war but by wheat and by cotton, by milk and by wool, by meat and by timber and by rice. These are words that translate into every language on earth. These are needs that challenge this world in arms.

He then went on to say:

... The purposes of this great work would be to help other peoples to develop the undeveloped areas of the world, to stimulate profitable and fair world trade, to assist all peoples to know the blessings of productive freedom.

The monuments to this new kind of war would be these: roads and schools, hospitals and homes, food and health.

We are ready, in short, to dedicate our strength to serving the *needs*, rather than the *fears*, of the world.

It is through these technical cooperation programs that the United States seeks to translate into practice those principles which are the moving force behind the inspiring words of our President.

Communist Influence In Guatemala

News Conference Statements by Secretary Dulles

Press releases 279 and 285 dated May 25

The Guatemalan nation and people as a whole are not Communists. They are predominantly patriotic people who do not want their nation to be dominated by any foreign power. However, it must be borne in mind that the Communists always operate in terms of small minorities who gain positions of power. In Soviet Russia itself only about 3 percent of the people are Communists.

In judging Communist influence in Guatemala three facts are significant:

1. Guatemala is the only American State which has not completed ratification of the Rio Pact of the Americas.

2. Guatemala was the only one of the American States which at the last inter-American Conference at Caracas voted against a declaration that "the domination or control of the political institu-

tions of any American State by the international communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America". . . .¹

3. Guatemala is the only American nation to be the recipient of a massive shipment of arms from behind the Iron Curtain.

It has been suggested from Guatemala that it needs more armament for defense. Already Guatemala is the heaviest armed of all the Central American States. Its military establishment is three to four times the size of that of its neighbors such as Nicaragua, Honduras, or El Salvador.

The recent shipment was effected under conditions which are far from normal. The shipment was loaded at the Communist-administered Port of Stettin. The ship was cleared for Dakar, Africa. The operation was cloaked under a series of chartering arrangements so that the real shipper was very difficult to discover. When he was discovered he claimed that the shipment consisted of nothing but optical glass and laboratory equipment. When the ship was diverted from its ostensible destination and arrived at Puerto Barrios, it was landed under conditions of extraordinary secrecy and in the personal presence of the Minister of Defense. One cannot but wonder why, if the operation was an aboveboard and honorable one, all of its details were so masked.

By this arms shipment a government in which Communist influence is very strong has come into a position to dominate militarily the Central American area. Already the Guatemalan Government has made gestures against its neighbors which they deem to be threatening and which have led them to appeal for aid.

The Guatemalan Government boasts that it is not a colony of the United States. We are proud that Guatemala can honestly say that. The United States is not in the business of collecting colonies. The important question is whether Guatemala is subject to Communist colonialism, which has already subjected 800 million people to its despotic rule. The extension of Communist colonialism to this hemisphere would, in the words of the Caracas Resolution, endanger the peace of America.

¹ BULLETIN of Apr. 26, 1954, p. 638.

Secretary Dulles was asked whether his statement on Guatemala left the implication that the sending of arms to Guatemala from behind the Iron Curtain might properly be covered by the Resolution of Caracas or the Rio Treaty. Mr. Dulles made the following reply:

The whole question of determining the circumstances justifying invoking the Rio Treaty is being studied. The evidence is being accumulated. We don't have it all at the present time, and until it is accumulated and until we have exchanged views with other American countries no decision has been made as to whether or not to invoke the consultative processes of the Rio Treaty.

Asked under what conditions the United States might act, whether alone or through implementation of the Rio Pact, Mr. Dulles replied:

We would expect to act under the Rio Pact, and in full conformity with our treaty obligations. No member of the Rio Pact gives up what the charter of the United Nations calls the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense; that right is reserved. Nevertheless, it is contemplated that, if the circumstances permit, there should be an effort, a sincere effort, at collective action and we would expect to comply with both the letter and the spirit of our treaty obligations.

Asked whether the United States intends to take the initiative in invoking the consultative clause of the Rio Treaty in the event none of the other member countries do so, Mr. Dulles replied:

That is an academic question because we know there are others who are prepared to take the initiative if the further development of the facts indicate there is a clear case on which to act.

Asked whether there would not be some delay in bringing about the implementation of the Rio Treaty, Mr. Dulles replied:

It would be possible to get very quick action by the consultative organ of the American States. They can be called into a meeting almost on 24-hour notice. I would not anticipate any difficulty if that event occurred in having very prompt and decisive action taken by the consultative organ.

Understanding Inter-American Economic Problems

by Merwin L. Bohan

U.S. Representative on the Inter-American Economic and Social Council¹

In two days, on May 22, we will be celebrating National Maritime Day. This day has been set aside by our Nation to pay honor to the American Merchant Marine. As President Eisenhower stated in his proclamation of Maritime Day:²

The American Merchant Marine has continued to aid in developing peaceful commercial relations with the nations of the free world; and through the prompt delivery of supplies and equipment to our armed forces overseas . . . has effectively helped to strengthen the forces of freedom throughout the world.

Because of the nearness of Maritime Day and because shipping is one of our country's oldest industries, as well as a vital factor in our national security, I would like to talk a little about the maritime policy of the United States and particularly its application to Latin America.

The maritime policy of the United States is clearly enunciated in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. If we eliminate all the legal phraseology which is an essential—if sometimes confusing—part of all legislation, our maritime policy consists of the following basic points:

One, we believe it is essential for both the national defense and the development of our foreign and domestic commerce that we have a merchant marine which is capable of carrying our domestic water-borne commerce.

Two, we believe it is essential, for the same reasons, that we have a merchant marine which is capable of carrying a substantial portion of our water-borne export and import foreign commerce; and

Three, we believe it is essential that we have a merchant marine which is capable of swiftly and effectively serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency.

¹ Excerpts from an address made before the Propeller Club, the Foreign Trade Association of Southern California, and the Los Angeles Traffic Managers Conference at Los Angeles on May 20 (press release 264 dated May 19).

² No. 3055; 19 Fed. Reg. 2797.

That is our policy. It is simple, straightforward and closely linked to the national defense and economic development needs of our country.

The carrying out of this policy is the responsibility of several government agencies including the Department of State. We in the Department are fully and constantly aware of this responsibility. We are also very much aware of the difficulties which are confronting U.S. shipping today and of the need for vigorous and intelligent action if we are to maintain the competitive position of United States vessels in foreign trade.

U.S. shipping in Latin America today faces a multitude of problems which are diverse and highly complex in nature. However, I do not think it is an unwarranted oversimplification to state that these problems result, in the main, from two basic factors. One is the desire of many of the other American Republics to develop and expand merchant shipping as an aspect of their national policy. The other, and this is particularly pertinent in Latin America, is the shortage of dollars and the desire to conserve those dollars which are available.

The development of maritime programs by Latin American nations since World War II has been at an accelerated pace. Impetus for such development resulted from many factors—in some cases from the fact that during the war we were forced to divert vitally needed cargo ships from the Latin American trade to carry our troops and supplies to the combat areas and, as a result, some difficulty was experienced in meeting the total shipping requirements of the other American Republics. In other cases maritime programs were a logical and predictable outgrowth of the economic progress of the area. In still other cases the desire to conserve foreign exchange was a motivating factor.

Whatever the reasons for the development of shipping programs, the facts are that those programs were pursued vigorously from the time of their inception, and today several Latin American countries are firmly established in international

shipping, particularly with the United States. Argentina, Brazil, and Chile have all increased their merchant fleets substantially. In addition, several other countries have embarked on joint shipping ventures. This has, naturally, resulted in much keener competition for United States shipping companies operating in Latin America.

I think it goes without saying that American business of all kinds has welcomed competition. And I think it also goes without saying that the U.S. shipping interests operating in Latin America today are not complaining about competition from foreign flag carriers. They are complaining about discriminatory practices, and I believe that when free competition is hampered by discriminatory practices this does become a matter of concern to our government.

Eliminating Discriminatory Practices

With other government agencies, and with representation of the shipping industry, the Department has been diligently working to eliminate discriminatory practices. And we have made some progress. One of the most heartening developments has been the success which we have achieved in various aspects of this problem as a result of negotiations with Colombia, Venezuela, and Brazil. The same is true, to a lesser extent, with Argentina and partial progress has also been made with Chile.

We are making progress but we are doing so slowly. Discrimination still continues and only sustained, vigorous representations can, with time, eliminate such discrimination.

When we meet in Rio de Janeiro next November with the other American Republics to discuss our mutual economic problems, we shall continue our efforts to assure competitive opportunities for U.S. business. I think that the system of inter-American conferences and meetings is a mechanism which is still not too well understood or appreciated in the United States. And I also think that such understanding and appreciation by all of us is essential if the inter-American system is to continue as a model of international relations. Therefore, I would like to spend a little time telling you about the latest and in some ways the most significant of the inter-American conferences—the Caracas conference from which I recently returned.³

In a nutshell, Latin America wants: (1) United States assistance in assuring "fair and equitable" prices for their raw materials; (2) assurances of stable tariffs and an expanding United States market for their products; (3) financial and technical cooperation in their economic development. It is

³ For a report on the Conference, see BULLETIN of Apr. 26, 1954, p. 634.

clear that we cannot wholly satisfy these aspirations. In the case of prices, we have a mutual interest in satisfactory price relationships since this means prosperity for all concerned, but we certainly do not have the resources even to consider price-parity formulas or plans involving vast financial commitments. We can assist in efforts to diversify the economics of the Latin American countries, thus lessening dependence on one or a few export products and possibly take other measures to mitigate the effects of price fluctuations. However, the best assurances we can offer of relative stability and "fairness" of prices is to maintain the high level of U.S. economic activity which is the major factor in raw material demand. In the field of commercial policy we must resist the arguments of those friends of ours in Latin America who hold that only we should reduce barriers to world trade and that they should be permitted to maintain any and all obstacles to the expansion of such trade. On the other hand, we are hopeful that by the time of the Rio conference we will be in a position to define our commercial policy objectives and give reasonable assurances regarding its continuity.

It is in the field of economic development where the greatest possibilities exist for the formulation of a dynamic inter-American policy. There are a number of obstacles, none unsurmountable, which complicate this problem of policy formulation. Latin America comes honestly by a heritage of state intervention in economic affairs, a heritage coming down from Spanish colonial times. In addition, mild to severe cases of economic nationalism have afflicted large parts of the area and given rise to a number of dangerous phobias which make the rational development of resources at times difficult and complex and at others, impossible. Offhand, I can think of several situations where the unfounded fear of foreign private participation is holding back the development of certain important countries and making it impossible for them to raise effectively the standard of living of their people.

U.S. Reliance on Private Enterprise

Against this background our own experience throughout the 19th century, when the U.S. was going through a period of economic development in many respects similar to that taking place to the south of us today, led to the conviction that domestic private enterprise plus the helping hand of foreign private capital and know-how was the way to build a stable and enduring economic structure. Indeed, our continued experience during the present century has only confirmed in our own minds that the way of economic life which goes by the name of private enterprise is the sound and true gospel. Certainly one of our deepest convictions is that governments, save in unusual situations, should stay out of business, whether as pro-

ducers, manufacturers, transporters, or marketers. Our own incursions in these fields have not always been too successful, while we have by no means lost sight of the somewhat unhappy experiences of certain highly developed and industrialized democracies which have experimented with socialism. And certainly Iron Curtain countries have given the best possible example of how collectivism can result in sub-standard levels of living. It would appear that state enterprise, by its nature, is inherently vulnerable to pressures which, while often admirable in aim and purpose, are not conducive to profitable, efficient, and competitive operations. Thus it is understandable that the U.S. is reluctant to participate in programs abroad under which governments would engage directly or indirectly in industries into which private enterprise—either domestic, foreign, or mixed—is willing to venture.

Placing, as we do, our main reliance on private capital as the primary source of foreign assistance in the economic development process, the basic conditions favorable to its attraction are of great importance. Some of these conditions rely upon the control of government while others are subject to the beneficent influence of sound policy.

The more important of these conditions include guarantees of property and contract rights. While the opportunity to earn a reasonable return on investment is, of course, the prize for which private enterprise strives at home and abroad, it generally requires no government guarantee of a reasonable return except in the case of public utilities or other regulated enterprise, but it does demand assurances that governments will not take actions which will make a reasonable return impossible.

What I have just said should not be interpreted as indicating that Latin America is against private enterprise. The proponents of private initiative are a growing and powerful force in all the major countries of the continent and in some the development process is passing through a period not unlike that to which we refer in our own country as the Era of Manifest Destiny. What I do wish to convey is that in all but a very few of our sister Republics, there is a tendency to be highly selective as concerns foreign private capital investment; to impose burdensome or prohibitory restrictions on certain fields of investment; and under popular pressure to promote the economic development processes or because of nationalistic complexes to engage directly in a number of fields of economic activity in which private initiative has a proven record of accomplishment.

Need for Greater Economic Understanding

There is thus an urgent need for greater economic understanding between us. If we are to

achieve that greater understanding, all of us will have carefully to reexamine our positions and our policies. Many of our sister Republics can profitably re-assess their attitudes toward the part that foreign capital and initiative could play in their economic development, while the U.S. can just as profitably reexamine and more clearly define certain of its policies in the foreign economic field. This reevaluation can be of distinct benefit to all concerned, for present trade and investment figures will be looked back upon as unimpressive if economic expansion in Latin America continues at the present rate. For the progress of this area in the postwar period has been little short of phenomenal; total production at constant prices has doubled in the last two decades; population has increased by 42 percent; and output per capita has grown at an annual rate of 2¼ percent. The value of manufacturing has gone up 70 percent in the last 7 years, and today industrial centers such as São Paulo and Mexico City make the classification of several of our neighbors as "underdeveloped" a constantly greater misnomer.

U.S. private investment has flowed into Latin America since the end of the Second World War at an average rate of around \$250 millions per year, and in addition, American companies have reinvested earnings at the average rate of approximately \$190 millions per year.

The U.S. Government has supplemented this flow of private capital. During the period since the Second World War the Latin American countries have been receiving loans through the International Bank, of which we are a member, and our own Export-Import Bank on a net basis (loans less repayment) at the rate of \$93 million per year, of which the Export-Import Bank has provided about 75 percent.

All of this foreign assistance, while essential for the financing of the foreign currency component of the economic development process, is, after all, only a small part of the total investment being made today in Latin America, since it is estimated that Latin America is financing between 90 and 95 percent of its economic development from domestic resources.

This is the bright side of the coin. The other side is that inflation has taken too great a toll of living standard gains and there is a crying need for sounder monetary and fiscal policy; population is increasing at a rate higher than the food supply and there are urgent needs in the fields of export industries, health and educational facilities, and other measures which will lead to the establishment in each of the Latin American countries of strong, self-reliant, and durable national economies.

We can and will play an important role in the years to come, but I am sure that we all agree with the words expressed recently by Assistant Secretary Holland, when he said:

As great as is our desire to contribute effectively to the establishment of strong and self-reliant economies elsewhere in this hemisphere, the primary responsibility in that field lies upon the nations involved. It is primarily through their foresight, industry, and self-discipline that this goal will be achieved.⁴

I who have lived for the better part of 50 years in the hospitable lands to the south of us have no doubt of their ability to achieve that goal.

U.S. Asks Approval for Construction of Libby Dam

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

Press release 287 dated May 27

On May 22, 1954, Secretary Dulles signed a new application to the International Joint Commission for an order approving the construction and operation of a multiple purpose dam on the Kootenai River about 15 miles upstream from Libby, Mont.

A previous application, submitted to the Commission on January 12, 1951,⁵ was withdrawn on April 8, 1953,⁶ when local problems developed regarding the location of roads, railroads, and other facilities. A new site about 4 miles upstream from the original location has now been selected as it will reduce the magnitude of the problems involved.

The new project will store 5,985,000 acre-feet of water, approximately 1 million acre-feet of which would be in Canada. The estimated cost of the project is \$263,300,000. Construction of the dam by the Army engineers was authorized by Congress in 1950, and planning funds of \$520,500 have been appropriated for 1954.

The reservoir would extend 53 miles upstream in the United States to the boundary and 42 miles into Canada and would be one-half to one and one-half miles wide. It would occupy approximately 47,800 acres, of which 30,200 are in the United States and 17,600 are in Canada.

The dam would be a concrete gravity structure rising 410 feet above bed rock and about 2,700 feet long at the crest of the dam. It would produce initially 600,000 kilowatts with an ultimate installation of 800,000 kilowatts. It would make possible the generation of approximately 90,000 additional kilowatts in Canada on the Kootenai River.

⁴ *Ibid.*, May 17, 1954, p. 770.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Feb. 5, 1951, p. 230.

⁶ *Ibid.*, Apr. 27, 1953, p. 611.

TEXT OF APPLICATION

MAY 22, 1954

THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., United States of America; and
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

SIRS:

1. The Government of the United States hereby submits to the International Joint Commission, under the provisions of Article IV of the Treaty of January 11, 1900, between the United States and Great Britain, this application requesting that the Commission give consideration to such effects as the construction and operation of a dam and reservoir, herein referred to as "Libby Dam", on the Kootenai River near Libby, Montana, may have on levels or stages of the said Kootenai River at and above the international boundary between the United States of America and Canada, and the consequences thereof; and that the Commission enter an appropriate order in the premises, expressly approving the construction and operation of the said Libby Dam and reservoir.

2. On January 12, 1951 an application was forwarded to the International Joint Commission relating to a similar project on the Kootenai River near Libby, Montana. Hearings on this application were held by the Commission and the possibility of proceeding with that project received very careful consideration by the Commission. On account of domestic questions which arose the application was withdrawn from the Commission on April 8, 1953 in order that they might be settled in regular channels without being intermingled with the international aspects of the problem.

3. Under the Flood Control Act of 1950 (Public Law 516, 81st Congress, 2d Session), approved 17 May 1950, a project designated as "Libby Dam, Kootenai River, Montana" was "adopted and authorized to be prosecuted under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers." Attached hereto and marked Annex A¹ is a statement, received by the Secretary of State with a letter dated May 5, 1954 from the Secretary of the Army, containing "data on Libby project to accompany 1954 application to the International Joint Commission." The Secretary of the Army has requested the Department of State to present it with this application to your Commission.

4. Particular attention is invited to the following important aspects of this Libby Dam Project:

a. The Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate on September 24, 1943 adopted a resolution which reads in part as follows:

"Resolved by the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under Section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 13, 1902, be, and is hereby requested to review the reports on Columbia River and Tributaries submitted under the provisions of House Document Numbered 308, Sixty-ninth Congress, first session, as authorized by the River and Harbor Act of January 21, 1927, with a view to determining whether any modification of existing projects or recommended comprehensive plans of improvement should be made at this time."

b. Pursuant to this authorization the United States proposed that the cooperation of the Government of Canada in comprehensive studies of the Columbia River Basin be obtained through a reference to the International Joint Commission under Article IX of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909. The reference to this Commission

¹ Spelled Kootenai in the United States, Kootenay in Canada. [Footnote in the original.]

² Not printed.

by the two Governments under date of March 9, 1944 resulted and exhaustive studies of the Columbia River Basin were made by the International Columbia River Engineering Board.

c. On November 1, 1950, the International Columbia River Engineering Board submitted to your Commission a report entitled: "Interim Report on Kootenay River". The report contained the following recommendation:

"In view of the foregoing and of the reference directive the Board recommends that the normal forebay elevation of 2,459 feet above mean sea level be approved for the Libby project . . ."

d. The reservoir would be approximately 95 miles long and from one-half to one and one-half miles wide. It would extend 42 miles into Canada approximately to the Bull River dam site, which is about 5 miles upstream from Wardner, British Columbia. With a full Libby reservoir the depth of water at the international boundary would be 150 feet. The reservoir will occupy approximately 47,800 acres, of which 17,600 acres are in Canada. In the Canadian portion, the reservoir would flood a few small communities and farms, and some secondary roads. In addition, it would necessitate the raising of the Canadian Pacific Railway Crows Nest line and No. 3 highway for short distances. The reservoir would have a gross storage capacity of 5,985,000 acre-feet, of which approximately 1,000,000 acre-feet would be in Canada. The usable storage capacity at 50 percent drawdown (172 feet) would be 5,010,000 acre-feet, of which 1,000,000 acre-feet would be in Canada.

e. The Dam as currently planned would be a straight concrete gravity structure rising about 410 feet above bed rock. It would be about 2,700 feet long at the top and 1,200 feet long at the base. The head provided for hydroelectric development at the site would be 344 feet at normal full pool elevation. An overflow spillway in line with the existing river channel, equipped with gates, would have a capacity of 280,000 cubic feet per second. For flood control operation of the dam a sufficient number of sluices would be provided to permit, when combined with the flow through three of the powerhouse units, a total release of 60,000 cubic feet per second when the power pool is fully drawn down.

f. The powerhouse would be located at the downstream toe of the dam near the left abutment. The initial installation would consist of six generating units rated at 100,000 kilowatts each, or a total of 600,000 kilowatts. The ultimate installation would consist of eight such units, or a total installation of 800,000 kilowatts.

g. The estimated cost of construction is \$263,321,000 of which approximately \$7,020,000 is the estimated cost of providing the portion of the reservoir in Canada, and approximately \$256,301,000 is the cost of the dam and the portion of the reservoir in the United States.

h. The project would provide much needed flood control and power benefits in both Canada and the United States.

5. Accordingly, the Government of the United States asks that the International Joint Commission approve the construction of the Libby Dam and the proposed method of operation of the dam and reservoir to elevation 2,459 feet above mean sea level. It is requested that the Commission, in accordance with Article VIII of the Treaty of January 11, 1909, make its order of approval conditional upon suitable and adequate provision being made for the protection and indemnity of all interests on the Canadian side of the boundary which may be injured thereby in accordance with the practice of the Commission in similar cases in which it has approved applications of this character.

6. This communication will, it is believed, be found by the Commission to contain all essential averments regarding the facts upon which this application is based and the nature of the order of approval desired, and to

be in conformity with the provisions of Paragraph (a) of Rule 6 and with Rule 7 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure.

7. In submitting this application to the Commission, the hope is expressed, on behalf of the United States, that in view of the importance of the matters involved, the Commission will expedite its consideration thereof and its action thereon in order that the project works and the plan of operation thereof may receive the approval of the Commission with the least possible delay.

8. Attached to Annex A of this application and made a part thereof are the maps and drawings showing the situation and extent of the project works.

The required additional copies of the application are being forwarded to you under separate cover.

Very truly yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Visit of Turkish Prime Minister

News Conference Statement by Secretary Dulles

Press release 281 dated May 25

Prime Minister Adnan Menderes of Turkey will visit the United States from June 1 to June 4. The Prime Minister's visit here will be primarily for the purpose of discussing with U. S. officials certain economic and financial matters of mutual interest to the United States and Turkey.

German Interzonal Travel

Following are the texts of letters exchanged by Ambassador James B. Conant, U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, and Vladimir Semenov, Soviet High Commissioner.

MR. SEMENOV TO AMBASSADOR CONANT, APRIL 17

[Translation]

I acknowledge receipt of your reply of March 17 to my letter of March 6,¹ in which it was proposed by me that measures be taken in the very near future by means of agreement between corresponding German authorities of East and West Germany to create two all-German committees: One for economic and administrative matters, and the other for cultural matters. I deem it necessary to draw your attention to the fact that the all-German committees mentioned in my letter could examine and decide questions of interrelationships between East and West Germany, including problems of passenger and freight traffic

¹ For texts, see BULLETIN of Apr. 5, 1954, pp. 509, 510.

across the demarcation line, the circulation of printed matter, and others, and thus facilitate a rapprochement between East and West Germany.

In your letter of reply, you in essence avoid these proposals, referring to the fact that questions of the movement of citizens, circulation of the press in Germany, etc., "must continue closely to concern the four occupying powers until such time as the reunification of Germany takes place." Meanwhile, it is impossible to agree with such an interpretation of the rights of the occupying powers in Germany. The circumstance that no peace treaty for the reunification of Germany has been agreed to among the four occupying powers by no means signifies that the occupying authorities, not having settled with the German people, nor with the fact that on the territory of Germany at the present time there exist the government of the German Democratic Republic and the government of West Germany, can ignore the right of the German people freely to determine their internal affairs according to their own judgment, without foreign interference.

From your letter, it is evident that you depart from those principles set as the basis for the relationships of the occupying authorities of the U.S.A., and of England and France also, with the German authorities and inhabitants of West Germany. These principles are well-known, as far as they are set forth in the "occupation statute" today in effect in West Germany, and also in the Bonn Agreement,² which is nothing but another aspect of the "occupation statute" signed among the governments of the U.S.A., England, and France and the West German government of Adenauer. In conformity with these documents, the occupying authorities of the three Western powers in reality keep in their hands for at least a 50-year term the broadest rights of interference in the internal affairs of West Germany.

The Soviet authorities cannot be equated with the regime tied to West Germany by the occupying authorities of the U.S.A., England, and France, as such a regime is unjust with respect to the German people and its national rights, and damaging the interests of upholding peace in Europe, especially if one takes into account that the Bonn agreement is tightly bound to the Paris Agreement,³ in accordance with which West Germany is transformed into a militaristic state, corresponding with the plans for creating the so-called European Defense Community.

In connection with this I take the liberty of drawing your attention to the declaration of the Soviet Government of March 26, in which it was demonstrated that the Soviet Union establishes

² I. e., the contractual agreements with the Federal Republic of Germany, signed at Bonn on May 26, 1952.

³ I. e., the treaty establishing the European Defense Community, signed at Paris on May 27, 1952.

with the German Democratic Republic the same relations as with other sovereign states and that the German Democratic Republic will be free to decide, by its own judgment, its internal and external affairs, including questions of interrelationships with West Germany. In the declaration, it was also pointed out that "the existence of the 'occupation statute,' established for West Germany by the United States of America, England, and France, is not only incompatible with the democratic principles and national rights of the German people but, in the present circumstances impeding the rapprochement between West and East Germany, is one of the obstacles on the road to the national reunification of Germany."

All the foregoing sufficiently explains why the Soviet side, as before, considers it necessary to take measures to create the aforesaid all-German committees in the very near future by means of agreement between corresponding agencies of West and East Berlin.

So far as the question of West Berlin, touched upon in your letter, is concerned, the American occupying authorities up to now have taken no steps to liquidate criminal organizations situated on the territory of West Berlin and carrying on their injurious work against the German Democratic Republic, although, as is known, that very circumstance has obliged the government of the GDR to put into effect some measures to control traffic on the territory of the GDR.

AMBASSADOR CONANT TO MR. SEMENOV, MAY 24

Press release 278 dated May 24

I acknowledge receipt of your reply, dated April 17, 1954, to the second letter I had sent you, on March 17, 1954, putting forward positive suggestions for the elimination of unjustifiable obstacles which prevent freedom of movement for Germans between the different parts of Germany.

In my letter of March 17, I drew your attention to unilateral measures which the authorities in the Soviet Zone could themselves take to this end without the need for any further consultation between us. I regret to note that no action has so far been taken by the authorities in the Soviet Zone to put these measures into effect and that you do not even refer to them in your reply. I further regret that you have made no response to my suggestion that arrangements should be made which would enable discussions to begin between German technical experts on those proposals in my letter of February 22⁴ on which consultation is required.

Instead you have invoked the Soviet Government's statement of March 26 regarding the sta-

⁴ BULLETIN of Apr. 5, 1954, p. 508.

tus of the German authorities in the Soviet Zone and you have once again repeated the Soviet proposal, which has already been rejected by my Government, for the establishment of "all-German Committees".

I must make it clear to you that my Government still regards the Soviet Union as the power responsible for the Soviet Zone of Germany. My Government does not recognize the sovereignty of the East German regime. In this connection, I take the opportunity of drawing your attention to the declaration made on April 8 by the High Commissioners of the United Kingdom and France and myself,⁵ a copy of which I enclose.

You have also repeated your charges about alleged criminal organizations which are said to be located in West Berlin. These charges are, as you have already been informed, without foundation. Your letter of April 17 therefore, since it introduces clearly unacceptable conditions and unfounded accusations, does not make a positive contribution to the problem of removing the restrictions on freedom of movement for the German people, and serves only to accentuate the present division of Germany.

So long as this division exists it remains the duty of the four occupying powers to do everything in their power to lessen the hardships resulting from it. I do not intend to be diverted from the constructive proposals I have already made to you and remain ready to take all the measures indicated in my letter of March 17. I hope therefore that, in order that we may make genuine progress in matters which are of real importance to the German people, you will accept my proposals without further objections.

Czechoslovak Protest Concerning Crusade for Freedom Rejected

Press release 277 dated May 24

Following is the text of a note to the Czechoslovak Government delivered on May 24 by the American Embassy at Prague to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in reply to the latter's note of May 5, 1954,⁶ concerning the release of balloons by the Crusade for Freedom:

The American Embassy presents its compliments to the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs and has the honor, upon instructions of the U. S. Government, to refer to the Ministry's note of May 5, 1954, concerning the arrival of balloons in Czechoslovakia.

The U. S. Government is informed that the Crusade for Freedom Committee has sent mes-

sages to the people of Czechoslovakia by the vehicle of balloons. The Crusade for Freedom, an organization of private citizens, is supported by millions of Americans and expresses the aspirations of the American people for the freedom of all peoples. The messages, it has been learned, transmitted news items and discussed concrete goals in which the Czechoslovak people would be interested.

The operation was undertaken by this private organization and neither the U. S. Government nor the U. S. authorities in Germany were involved. The U. S. Government rejects the protest of the Czechoslovak Government which is without foundation.

As has been previously suggested, the United States holds firmly to the view that there must exist unobstructed communication between peoples if nations are to live in peace and freedom with one another. When a government violates this principle by trying to insulate its people from the world of ideas without, it is only natural that efforts will be made, both inside and outside that country, to break through the insulation. The choice of balloons as a means of communication in the present instance indicates that the Czechoslovak Government continues to deprive the Czechoslovak people of the possibilities of free contact with other peoples, the free exchange of ideas and the free reception of uncensored news.

It is understandable that the American people would seek by such means as are available to maintain contact with the people of Czechoslovakia with whom they had formerly enjoyed free association and with whom they share many common traditions and beliefs. The American people take a profound interest in the welfare and future of the people of Czechoslovakia. The leaflets borne to Czechoslovakia express the interest of the American public in seeing the welfare of the people there improved through the attainment of a series of goals. Notwithstanding, the Czechoslovak Government claims that these leaflets were subversive and inciting. It consequently appears that in the eyes of the present regime in Czechoslovakia discussion of concrete steps to better the lot of the common man in that country is subversive in nature.

If the Czechoslovak Government desires that this form of communication between peoples not be utilized, it lies within its power to remove the need for such media by opening the barrier to free access to the people of Czechoslovakia. The United States is convinced that free contact between peoples everywhere will contribute greatly to support world peace in which the Government of Czechoslovakia professes continuing interest. The U. S. Government would have no basis for interfering with attempts by private American organizations to establish communication with the people of Czechoslovakia and to convey to them the interest of the American people in their fate.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Apr. 19, 1954, p. 588.

⁶ Not printed.

Accreditation of Latvian Chargé d'Affaires

Press release 274 dated May 24

Secretary Dulles on May 24 received Arnolds Spekke, who presented his letter of appointment as Chargé d'Affaires of Latvia in Washington. Dr. Spekke, a career minister in the Latvian diplomatic service, becomes chief of the Latvian diplomatic mission in the United States in succession to the late Jules Feldmans, who died on August 16, 1953. The texts of the remarks exchanged by Dr. Spekke and the Secretary follow.

Remarks of Dr. Spekke

I have the honor to present to you the Letters of Mr. Charles Zarine, Latvian Minister in London, and bearer of the Special Emergency Powers of the last Legal Government of Latvia, accrediting me to you as Chargé d'Affaires of Latvia in the United States.

It is a great honor and pleasure for me to represent the Independent Republic of Latvia in this great country, the United States of America. I have come to the United States with a sincere desire and a firm determination to continue the work of my predecessor, the late Minister Jules Feldmans, who was devoted to the task of bringing closer to the American Nation the problems of the people of Latvia, who are presently subjugated by the Soviet Union.

Before assuming my duties in Washington, at this trying and difficult time in the long history of the Latvian people, I wish to express to Your Excellency, to the Government, and to the people of the United States of America my undying gratitude for their moral support and for the traditionally unswerving stand of the United States in favor of the rights of the oppressed nations, which has become a beacon of light and a source of strength and inspiration to mankind.

Mr. Secretary, I beg you to accept the sincere good wishes that Mr. Zarine, bearer of the Latvian State emergency powers, expresses through me, to which I join my own best wishes, for Your Excellency's personal happiness. I also wish to express to you on this occasion our hope for the preservation of our Christian civilization and the maintenance of the dignity of free men and all peoples of good will.

Remarks of Secretary Dulles

I have received from your hands the letters of April 21, 1954, in which Mr. Charles Zarine, Minister of Latvia in London and bearer of the special emergency power of the last independent Government of the Republic of Latvia, presents

you to me as Chargé d'Affaires of Latvia in the United States. You come in succession to the late Mr. Jules Feldmans whose distinguished and devoted services in representing his country to the United States were cut short by his untimely death last year.

In accepting you as Chief of the Latvian Mission in Washington in the capacity of Chargé d'Affaires, this Government reaffirms its wholehearted support for the Republic of Latvia and for the realization of the principle, expressed in the Atlantic Charter, that sovereign rights and self-government shall be restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

I am confident that in carrying on the work to which your predecessors gave themselves unsparingly in defense of the cause of a free Latvia, you will enjoy, as they did, the dedicated support of Latvians everywhere. I am happy to welcome you to this country and to wish you every success in undertaking your duties here. You may be assured that my associates in the Department and I will always be ready to help you in every way we can.

I would ask you to thank Minister Zarine for his expression of good wishes, which are warmly reciprocated, on behalf of the Latvian nation and himself for the welfare and prosperity of the United States.

TREATY INFORMATION

The Genocide Convention

*Following is the text of a summary of the U.N. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, prepared by the Department of State, which Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, sent on May 10 to Senator Alexander Wiley at the latter's request:*¹

The United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 9, 1948. It has entered into force for 43 countries. The United States has not ratified the convention and is not a party to it. Accordingly, its provisions in no way bind the United States or its citizens.

¹ Reprinted from *Cong. Rec.* of May 19, 1954, p. 6432.

Background

On December 11, 1946, the first session of the United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution condemning genocide as a crime under international law.² That resolution declared that punishment of the crime of genocide, the denial of the right to existence of entire human groups, is a matter of international concern. It recommended international cooperation with a view to facilitating the prevention and punishment of genocide and requested the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations to undertake the necessary studies to draw up a draft convention on the subject.

Pursuant to this resolution, a special United Nations committee met in 1948 and prepared a draft convention on genocide. This draft was reviewed by the Economic and Social Council and in the fall of 1948 was transmitted to the General Assembly. The legal committee of the General Assembly debated the matter and the convention was adopted by unanimous vote of the General Assembly on December 9, 1948.

Signature of the Convention

The Genocide Convention was opened for signature on December 11, 1948. Pursuant to its terms, it remained open for signature until December 31, 1949 and subsequently for accession by nations which had not signed. It was signed on behalf of 43 nations, including the United States. Of that number 27 have since ratified the convention and thus become parties to it. Sixteen other nations have become parties by deposit of instruments of accession.

The act of signature of the Genocide Convention imported neither a legal nor a moral obligation to ratify the convention. Signature of a treaty is merely the last formal step between completion of successful negotiations and submission of the document for approval and ratification by the competent authorities of the signatory states. Signature of a treaty on behalf of a state creates no obligation to ratify the treaty.

The terms of the Genocide Convention require that it be ratified in order to become effective after signature. It cannot be made effective as an executive agreement. The second paragraph of article XI specifically provides:

The present convention shall be ratified, and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary General of the United Nations.

Consequently, a signatory government is not bound by the convention until it has deposited its instrument of ratification and the convention has been brought into force with respect to it. Governments which have signed the Genocide Con-

vention but have failed to ratify it are under no legal duty to execute its provisions or to carry out in any way the obligations created by it.

Entry Into Force

The Genocide Convention entered into force, pursuant to its terms, on January 2, 1951, the 90th day following the date of deposit of the 20th instrument of ratification or accession. It became effective only as to those countries which had deposited the necessary ratifications or accessions. The convention is presently in effect for the following 43 countries:

Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria,⁴ Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia,⁴ Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary,⁴ Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Korea, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, Monaco, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Philippines,⁴ Poland,⁴ Rumania,⁴ Saudi Arabia, Sweden, Turkey, Viet-Nam, Yugoslavia.

The United States Has Not Ratified the Genocide Convention

The convention was signed on behalf of the United States on December 11, 1948, by Ernest A. Gross, acting under a full power issued by the President authorizing him to sign a convention for the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide, "the said convention to be transmitted to the President of the United States of America for his ratification, subject to the advice and consent thereto of the Senate of the United States of America."

The President transmitted the convention to the United States Senate on June 16, 1949, for advice and consent to ratification. It was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee and ordered to be printed.⁵ Public hearings were held in January and February of 1950 before a subcommittee, and the convention was thereafter discussed in executive sessions of the Foreign Relations Committee. After nearly 5 years the Genocide Convention is still pending in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee without having received the recommendation of that committee.

In accordance with the statement of the Secretary of State before the Senate Judiciary Committee on April 6, 1953, the Department of State is not pressing for ratification of the Genocide Convention.⁶

² The U. S. S. R. deposited its ratification, with reservations, on May 3, 1954. It will become effective on August 1, 1954, the 90th day after deposit.

³ With reservations.

⁴ Senate Executive O, 81st Cong., 1st sess.

⁵ Hearings on S. J. Res. 1 and 43, p. 886. [See also BULLETIN of Apr. 20, 1953, p. 592.]

⁶ General Assembly Resolution 96 (I), Dec. 11, 1946, U.N. Doc. A/64/Add. 1.

Summary

The United States Senate has not given its advice and consent to ratification of the Genocide Convention. That convention accordingly has not been ratified by the President of the United States and is not in force for the United States. Its provisions have no binding effect within the United States and have in no way abridged or affected the rights and freedoms of American citizens.

U.S. and Iceland Agree on Implementing of Defense Agreement

Press release 286 dated May 26

The United States and Iceland on May 25 reached an understanding on changes in the methods of implementing the U.S.-Icelandic Defense Agreement of May 5, 1951.¹ In response to the request of the Icelandic Government received last December, representatives of the United States and Iceland—including an advisory team from the Departments of State and Defense—began discussions February 2. Agreement was effected by an exchange of notes between the Icelandic Foreign Minister and the American Minister to Iceland, Edward B. Lawson, who negotiated the original agreement of 1951.

In general the understandings reached are technical in nature. They pertain chiefly to how defense construction work in Iceland and the planning, arrangement, and operation of the military areas in Iceland can best be effected consistent with NATO objectives of defending Iceland and the North Atlantic area, while also taking into account problems peculiar to Iceland.

The basic U.S.-Iceland Defense Agreement of May 5, 1951, was negotiated at the request of NATO in view of Iceland's lack of defenses. It has not been altered in these negotiations.

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Narcotics

Protocol for limiting and regulating the cultivation of the poppy plant, the production of, international and wholesale trade in, and use of opium.² Dated at New York June 23, 1953.

Ratification deposited: Canada, May 7, 1954.

Transportation

Convention on road traffic. Dated at Geneva September

¹ For text, see BULLETIN of May 21, 1951, p. 812.

² Not in force.

19, 1949. Entered into force March 26, 1952. TIAS 2487.

Ratification deposited: Belgium, April 23, 1954.

Application to: Belgian Congo and Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (notification by Belgium given April 23, 1954).

Protocol relating to adherence to the convention on road traffic of certain countries which were not able to participate in the United Nations conference on road and motor transport. Formulated at Geneva September 19, 1949. TIAS 2487.

Ratification deposited: Belgium, April 23, 1954.

United Nations

Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Concluded at London November 16, 1945. Entered into force November 4, 1946. TIAS 1580.

Signature: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, April 21, 1954.

Acceptance deposited: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, April 21, 1954.

Convention on the prevention and punishment of the crime of genocide. Opened for signature December 9, 1948. Entered into force January 12, 1951.³

Ratification deposited: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, May 3, 1954.⁴

War

Geneva convention relative to treatment of prisoners of war;

Geneva convention for amelioration of the condition of the wounded and sick in the armed forces in the field;

Geneva convention for amelioration of the condition of the wounded, sick and shipwrecked members of armed forces at sea;

Geneva convention relative to protection of civilian persons in time of war.

Dated at Geneva August 12, 1949. Entered into force October 21, 1950.⁵

Ratification deposited: Cuba, April 15, 1954.

Weather Stations

Agreement on North Atlantic Ocean Stations.⁶ Dated at Paris February 25, 1954.

Acceptance deposited: Sweden, April 23, 1954.

BILATERAL

Cuba

Agreement renewing for an indefinite period the agreement concluded in 1953 to facilitate the informal visits of war vessels. Effected by exchange of notes at Habana November 23, 1953 and January 20, 1954. Entered into force January 20, 1954.

United Kingdom

Supplementary protocol amending the convention for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income of April 16, 1945 as modified by the supplementary protocol of June 6, 1946. Signed at Washington May 25, 1954. Enters into force upon the exchange of ratifications.

³ Not in force for the United States.

⁴ Ratification included reservations made at the time of signing.

⁵ Not in force; for entry into force provisions, see BULLETIN of Apr. 26, 1954, p. 653.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Calendar of Meetings¹

Adjourned During May 1954

U. N. Commission on Narcotic Drugs: 9th Session	New York	Apr. 19-May 14
U. N. Economic Commission for Europe: 2d East-West Trade Consultation.	Geneva	Apr. 20-May 3
ICAO Conference on Coordination of European Air Transport	Strasbourg	Apr. 21-May 8
UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference on Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.	The Hague	Apr. 21-May 12
Lyon International Fair: 36th Annual	Lyon	Apr. 25-May 3
International Conference on Oil Pollution of the Sea and Coasts	London	Apr. 26-May 12
ITU Administrative Council: 9th Session	Geneva	May 1-30
UPU Executive and Liaison Committee	Lucerne	May 3-15
U. N. ECAFE Inland Waterways Subcommittee: 2d Session	Saigon	May 3-8
International Rubber Study Group: 11th Meeting	Colombo	May 3-11
World Health Organization: 7th Assembly	Geneva	May 4-22
International Sugar Council: 3d Meeting of 1st Session	London	May 5-7
American International Institute for Protection of Childhood: Annual Meeting of Directing Council.	Montevideo	May 10-15
ILO Advisory Committee on Salaried Employees and Professional Workers: 3d Session.	Geneva	May 10-22
ICAO Special Middle East Regional Communications Meeting	Rhodes	May 11-28*
15th International Conference on Large Electric High Tension Systems (CIGRE).	Paris	May 12-22
International North Pacific Fisheries Commission: Meeting of Committee on Biology and Research.	Tokyo	May 17-31
FAO Committee on Financial Control: 18th Session	Rome	May 17-22
Food and Agriculture Organization: 3d Conference on Mechanical Wood Technology.	Paris	May 17-27
U. N. ECAFE Regional Conference on Water Resource Development	Tokyo	May 17-22
Caribbean Commission: 18th Meeting	Belize	May 19-24
ILO Governing Body: 125th Session (and Committees)	Geneva	May 24-29

In Session as of May 31, 1954

Geneva Conference	Geneva	Apr. 26-
U. N. Conference on Customs Formalities for the Temporary Importation of Private Vehicles and for Tourism.	New York	May 11-
U. N. Disarmament Commission, Subcommittee of Five (Powers): 2d Meeting.	New York	May 13-
International Fair of Navigation	Naples	May 15-
WHO Executive Board: 14th Meeting	Geneva	May 24-
Rice Consultative Committee: 8th Meeting	Singapore	May 26-
11th International Ornithological Congress	Basel	May 29-
10th International Congress of Agricultural and Food Industries	Madrid	May 30-

Scheduled June 1-August 31, 1954

ICAO Assembly: 8th Session	Montreal	June 1-
ILO Annual Conference: 37th Session	Geneva	June 2-
U. N. Trusteeship Council: 14th Session	New York	June 2-
FAO Committee on Commodity Problems: 23d Session	Rome	June 3-
U. N. International Law Commission: 6th Session	Paris	June 3-
International Cotton Advisory Committee: 13th Plenary Meeting	São Paulo	June 7-
UNESCO Intergovernmental Conference of Experts on Cultural Relations and Conventions.	Paris	June 8-

¹ Prepared in the Division of International Conferences May 21, 1954. Asterisks indicate tentative dates and locations. Following is a list of abbreviations: U.N., United Nations; ICAO, International Civil Aviation Organization; UNESCO, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; ITU, International Telecommunication Union; UPU, Universal Postal Union; ECAFE, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East; ILO, International Labor Organization; CIGRE, Conference Internationale Des Grands Reseaux Electriques; FAO, Food and Agriculture Organization; WHO, World Health Organization; ECE, Economic Commission for Europe; WMO, World Meteorological Organization; CITT, International Telegraph Consultative Committee (Comité consultatif internationale telegraphique); GATT, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Calendar of Meetings—Continued

Scheduled June 1–August 31, 1954—Continued

Fifth Inter-American Travel Congress	Panamá City	June 10–
International Exposition in Bogotá	Bogotá	June 13–
Fao of Latin American Forestry Commission: Meeting of Committee on Research	Rio de Janeiro	June 14–
International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries: 4th Annual Meeting	Halifax	June 14–
International Meeting of Tonnage Measurement Experts	Paris	June 14–
U. N. ECE Regional Conference of Statisticians	Geneva	June 14–
U. N. Permanent Central Opium Board and Narcotic Drugs Supervisory Body: 11th Joint Session	Geneva	June 14–
ICAO Meteorology Division: 4th Session	Montreal	June 15–
WMO Commission for Aeronautical Meteorology: 1st Session	Montreal	June 15–
Civil Aviation Meet (Centenary of São Paulo)	São Paulo	June 16–
International Wheat Council: 15th Session	London	June 16–
ILO Governing Body: 126th Session	Geneva	June 25*
UNESCO Seminar on Educational and Cultural Television Program Production	London	June 27–
U.N. Economic and Social Council (Ecosoc): 18th Session	Geneva	June 29–
ITU International Telegraph Consultative Committee (CCTT): Study Group XI	Geneva	June 30–
International Exposition and Trade Fair	São Paulo	July 1–
8th International Botanical Congress	Paris	July 2–
17th International Conference on Public Education (jointly with UNESCO)	Geneva	July 5–
XVth International Exhibition of Cinematographic Art	Venice	July 6–
International Union of Pure and Applied Physics: 8th General Assembly	London	July 6–
6th Pan American Highway Congress	Caracas	July 11–
International Whaling Commission: 6th Meeting	Tokyo	July 19–
International Union of Crystallography: 3d General Assembly	Paris	July 21–
GATT Ad Hoc Committee for Agenda and Intersessional Meeting	Geneva	July 21–
4th Inter-American Congress of Sanitary Engineering	São Paulo	July 25–
World Power Conference: Sectional Meeting	Rio de Janeiro	July 25–
International Union of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics: 4th General Assembly	Brussels	July 27–
International Union for the Protection of Nature: 4th General Assembly	Copenhagen	July 28–
3d Inter-American Conference on Indian Life	La Paz	Aug. 2–
10th World's Poultry Congress	Edinburgh	Aug. 13–
5th International Congress of Soil Science	Léopoldville	Aug. 16–
U.N. Committee on Information from Non-Self-Governing Territories: 5th Session	New York	Aug. 20–
31st International Congress of Americanists	São Paulo	Aug. 23–
International Scientific Radio Union: 11th General Assembly	Amsterdam	Aug. 23–
Interparliamentary Union: 43d Conference	Vienna	Aug. 26–
International Mathematical Union: 2d General Assembly	The Hague	Aug. 30–
U.N. World Population Congress	Rome	Aug. 31–
WMO Executive Committee: 5th Session	Geneva	August or September

Thermonuclear Tests in Pacific Trust Territory

STATEMENT BY HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR. U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE U.N.

U.S./U.N. press release 1917 dated May 14

The United States Government is very sorry indeed that some inhabitants of the Marshall Islands apparently have suffered ill effects from the recent thermonuclear tests in the Pacific proving grounds, as described in the petition to the United Nations. This is a matter of real and deep concern to the American people and government, who take very seriously our responsibilities toward

the inhabitants of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

I can assure them, as well as the members of the United Nations, that the authorities in charge are doing everything humanly possible to take care of everyone who was in the area affected by the unexpected falling of radioactive materials caused by a shift in the wind during the March 1 test.

The 236 Marshallese citizens in the affected area were immediately given the same medical examination as the American personnel of the test group who were similarly exposed. They were promptly evacuated to the United States Naval Station at Kwajalein, where their needs were immediately provided for by the United States Navy. In addition, a team of medical experts from the Atomic

Energy Commission, United States Navy and Army, was promptly formed and sent to Kwajalein—and the services of the American Red Cross office at Kwajalein were enlisted—to assure any necessary medical attention and care for the personal well-being of all concerned. They are remaining under close observation and any of them who may need it will continue to receive the best medical attention.

I am informed that there is no medical reason to expect any permanent after-effects on their general health, due to the falling of radioactive materials.

The United States Government considers the request and the suggestions of the petitioners both reasonable and helpful. The restraint and moderation with which they have been presented evokes admiration and sympathy.

Regarding the petitioners' requests, that "all experiments with lethal weapons within this area be immediately ceased," attention is called to the United States Government's announcement of May 13 that "the 1954 series of tests . . . have been completed," and that "within a few days sea and air traffic may be safely resumed within the 'warning area' which was set up for safety purposes for the time when the tests were taking place. Official notice to mariners and airmen will be published."

As the petitioners rightly imply, the United States would not have been conducting such tests if it had not been determined after very careful study that they were required in the interests of general peace and security. The selection of test sites in this particular area was made only after very careful examination of the alternative possibilities, and in an effort to insure that the tests were carried out with least possible danger. It will be recalled that, pursuant to the provisions of the trusteeship agreement which designate the trust territory as a strategic area, the United States notified the United Nations on April 2, 1953, that the area of the Pacific proving grounds was being closed for security reasons in order to conduct necessary atomic experiments.

Let me also assure all the inhabitants of the Pacific trust territory, and the members of the United Nations, that the United States authorities are doing everything possible to prevent any recurrence of possible danger. The United States Government is taking and will continue to take "all possible precautionary measures . . . before such weapons are exploded," as suggested by the Marshallese citizens. We also agree that "all people in the area be instructed in safety measures" and that instructions be given to Marshallese medical practitioners and health aides which will be useful in detecting danger and avoiding harm.

Further, it is reasonable and right, as the petitioners suggest, that any Marshallese citizens who are removed as a result of test activities, will be

reestablished in their original habitat in such a way that no financial loss would be involved.

The United States Government, and the officials immediately concerned with the administration of the territory, greatly appreciate the words of commendation of the petitioners with respect to the way the territory is being administered.

The welfare of the inhabitants has been the constant concern of the United States Governments, and particularly of the High Commissioner, who will continue to spare no effort necessary to give effect to the Trusteeship Agreement.

TEXT OF MARSHALLESE PETITION

U.N. doc. T/PET.10/28
Dated May 6, 1954

APRIL 20TH, 1954

To: The United Nations
From: The Marshallese people
Subject: Complaint regarding the explosion of lethal weapons within our home islands

The following should not be misconstrued as a repudiation of the United States as our governing agency for the United Nations under the trusteeship agreement, for aside from the complaint registered in this petition we have found the American administration by far the most agreeable one in our memory. But in view of the increasing danger from the experiments with deadly explosives thousands of times more powerful than anything previously known to men, the lethal effects of which have already touched the inhabitants of two of the atolls in the Marshalls, namely, Rongelab and Uterik, who are now suffering in various degrees from "lowering of blood count," burns, nausea and the falling off of hair from the head, and whose complete recovery no one can promise with any certainty, we, the Marshallese people feel that we must follow the dictates of our consciences to bring forth this urgent plea to the United Nations, which has pledged itself to safeguard the life, liberty and the general well being of the people of the Trust Territory, of which the Marshallese people are a part.

The Marshallese people are not only fearful of the danger to their persons from these deadly weapons in case of another miscalculation, but they are also very concerned for the increasing number of people who are being removed from their land.

Land means a great deal to the Marshallese. It means more than just a place where you can plant your food crops and build your houses; or a place where you can bury your dead. It is the very life of the people. Take away their land and their spirits go also.

The Marshall Islands are all low coral atolls with land area where food plants can be cultivated quite limited, even for today's population of about eleven-thousand people. But the population is growing rapidly; the time when this number will be doubled is not far off.

The Japanese had taken away the best portions of the following atolls; Jaluit, Kwajalein, Eniwetak, Mille, Maloelap and Wotje to be fortified as part of their preparation for the last war, World War II. So far, only Imedj Island on Jaluit Atoll has been returned to its former owners.

For security reasons, Kwajalein Island is being kept for the military use. Bikini and Eniwetak were taken away for Atomic bomb tests and their inhabitants were moved to Kili Island and Ujelang Atoll respectively. Because Rongelab and Uterik are now radio-active, their inhabitants are being kept on Kwajalein for an indeterminate length of time. "Where next?" is the big question which looms large in all of our minds.

Therefore, we the members of the Marshallese Congress

Hold-Over Committee, writers of this petition, who are empowered by the Marshallese Congress, to act in its name when it is not in session and which is in turn a group of members representing all the municipalities in the Marshalls, due to the increasing threat to our life, liberty, happiness and possession of land, do hereby submit this petition to the United Nations with the hope that it will act on our urgent plea. Thus, we request that:

1. All the experiments with lethal weapons within this area be immediately ceased.

2. If the experiments with said weapons should be judged absolutely necessary for the eventual well being of all the people of this world and cannot be stopped or changed to other areas due to the unavailability of other locations, we then submit the following suggestions:

(a) All possible precautionary measures be taken before such weapons are exploded. All human beings and their valuable possessions be transported to safe distances first, before such explosions occur.

(b) All the people living in this area be instructed in safety measures. The people of Rongelab would have avoided much danger if they had known not to drink the waters on their home island after the radio-active dusts had settled on them.

(c) Adequate funds be set aside to pay for the possessions of the people in case they will have to be moved from their homes. This will include lands, houses and whatever possessions they cannot take with them, so that the unsatisfactory arrangements for the Bikinians and Eniwetak people shall not be repeated.

(d) Courses be taught to Marshallese Medical Practitioners and Health-Aides which will be useful in the detecting of and the circumventing of preventable dangers.

We would be very pleased to submit more information or explain further any points we have raised that may need clarifications.

The Marshallese people who signed this petition are on the following sheets, divided in the following manner: The first group are members of the Marshallese Congress Hold-Over Committee. The second group are some of the many interested Marshallese citizens. The name of each person appears on the left hand side and his or her home atoll and occupation on the right hand side opposite the signature.

If more signatures are needed we will promptly supply them. The only reason we are not supplying more now is because to do so would mean a delay of some three months, the time necessary to make complete circuit of our far-flung atolls and islands by ship.

[Signed by 11 members of the Marshallese Congress Hold-over Committee.]

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography¹

General Assembly

Peace Observation Commission. Balkan Sub-Commission. Ninth periodic report of the United Nations Military Observers in Greece. Letter dated 12 April 1954 from the Principal Military Observer submitting report

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

covering the period from 1 January to 12 April 1954. A/CN.7/SC.1/54. April 19, 1954. 3 pp. mimeo.

Nationality Including Statelessness. Report on Multiple Nationality by Roberto Cordova, Special Rapporteur. A/CN.4/83. April 22, 1954. 33 pp. mimeo.

Nationality Including Statelessness. Addendum to Comments by Governments on the Draft Convention on the Elimination of Future Statelessness and on the Draft Convention on the Reduction of Future Statelessness. A/CN.4/82/Add.2. May 5, 1954. 8 pp. mimeo.

Secretariat

UN Fact Series: the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, the Secretariat, Economic Commission for Europe, Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, Economic Commission for Latin America. ST/DPI/SER.C/1-9. March 1, 1954. 26 pp.

The Question of Korea (1950-1953). ST/DPI/SER.A/79. March 10, 1954. 44 pp.

The Assay, Characteristics, Composition, and Origin of Opium. No. 28. Trials of Unknown Opiums by Canadian Scientists for Origin Determinations. ST/SOA/SER.K/28. April 29, 1954. 5 pp. mimeo.

Disarmament Commission

Communication Dated 19 April 1954 to the Secretary-General from the Permanent Observer of Japan to the United Nations Transmitting a Letter from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan Dated 13 April 1954 Enclosing a Resolution Passed by the House of Councillors on 5 April 1954. DC/50. April 21, 1954. 3 pp. mimeo.

Letter Dated 23 April 1954 to the Secretary-General from the Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations. DC/51. April 23, 1954. 2 pp. mimeo.

Economic and Social Council

Rural Electrification. E/ECE/173, Volume II. E/ECE/EP/137, Volume II. March 1954. 182 pp.

Bibliography on the Processes and Problems of Industrialization in Under-Developed Countries. E/2538. March 29, 1954. 76 pp. mimeo.

Full Employment. Measures to Prevent Possible Inflation at High Levels of Economic Activity. E/2563. April 6, 1954. 125 pp. mimeo.

Full Employment. Reconversion After the Rearmament Period. E/2564. April 14, 1954. 40 pp. mimeo.

United Nations Programme of Technical Assistance. Under General Assembly resolutions 200 (III), 246 (III), 418 (V), 723 (VIII) and Economic and Social Council resolution 222 A (IX). Report by the Secretary-General. E/2575. April 20, 1954. 42 pp. mimeo.

Full Employment. Measures to Prevent Possible Inflation at High Levels of Economic Activity. E/2563/Add.1. April 22, 1954. 47 pp. mimeo.

Statelessness. Draft Protocol Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons. Problem of Statelessness: Consolidated Report by the Secretary-General Under Council Resolution 352 (XII) and Memorandum by the Secretary-General on the Action Taken by the International Law Commission. Report of the Social Committee. E/2580. April 22, 1954. 3 pp. mimeo.

Freedom of Information. Encouragement and Development of Independent Domestic Information Enterprises. Report of the Social Committee. E/2584. April 28, 1954. 3 pp. mimeo.

A Report on Educational Exchange Under the Fulbright Act in 1953¹

During 1953, about 7,000 persons were exchanged with 70 countries through exchange programs administered by the Department of State under the Fulbright Act, the Smith-Mundt Act and other acts of Congress. Participants included students, educators, newsmen, industrialists, specialists and leaders in other fields who are influential in molding public opinion overseas. Their visits have a single purpose—to contribute to mutual understanding between the United States and other countries. More specifically, in the light of the present world crisis, this purpose is to bring about a greater world-wide understanding of, confidence in, and cooperation with the United States; to further the realization among other peoples that the objectives and policies of the United States are in harmony with and will advance their own legitimate aspirations for peace, progress and freedom; and to create a greater spirit of unity, hopefulness, and determination among free peoples.

The enactment of the Fulbright Act in 1946 made it possible to extend the exchange program, originally authorized for Latin America in 1938 as part of our Good Neighbor Policy, to certain countries beyond the Western Hemisphere. Congress later provided, in the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948, the general framework for exchange activities on a world-wide basis. Within this framework, the Department conducts special programs in Germany and Austria under an appropriation for Government in Occupied Areas, and in Finland and India under payments of those countries that have been set aside by legislation for this purpose.

The following report is limited to the exchange activities carried out under the Fulbright Act, and is submitted in accordance with Section 32 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended August 1, 1946, by the Fulbright Act. Specifically, it covers those activities authorized by paragraph 32 (b) (2) of the Fulbright Act which were car-

ried out during the period January 1 through December 31, 1953.

Status of Executive Agreements

No executive agreements were signed in 1953. Altogether, 28 executive agreements have been signed since the act was passed in 1946. However, programs have since been suspended in three countries—China (Formosa), Korea and Iran. The exchange activities described in this report were carried out under executive agreements with the following 25 countries: Australia, Austria, Belgium-Luxembourg, Burma, Ceylon, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, India, Iraq, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa and the United Kingdom.

The carrying out of executive agreements was affected by the provisions of Section 1415 of Public Law 547, 82nd Congress, the Rabaut Amendment. The effect of this amendment is to require the purchase in dollars, from the Treasury Department, of all foreign currencies used in the program, thereby making commitments under executive agreements dependent on annual dollar appropriations by the Congress. A request was made for exemption of the program from the provisions of the Rabaut Amendment. While Congress did not approve the exemption, it did provide for the carrying out of existing agreements, as well as for the making of new agreements for periods in excess of one year, subject to the availability of appropriations for this purpose (Section 1313 of the General Provisions of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1953, Public Law 207, 83rd Congress).

The dwindling supply of foreign currencies available under the Fulbright Act threatens the continuation of the program in a number of countries. For example, such currencies are no longer available in Turkey and a similar situation is in prospect in the immediate future in Egypt and India. Altogether, exchange programs will expire in the following 8 countries by 1956 unless additional foreign currencies become available: Ceylon, Egypt, India, Iraq, Pakistan, Sweden, Thailand and the Union of South Africa.

¹Excerpts from *Report on the Operations of the Department of State under Public Law 584* (House Doc. no. 365, 83d Cong., 2d sess.), Apr. 7, 1954. The report includes letters of transmittal from the President and the Secretary of State and tables showing geographical distribution of awards, fields of study and teaching, American and foreign recipients, and funds available and expenditures.

It was hoped that the growing shortage of foreign currencies might be somewhat offset through the provisions of Section 11 of Public Law 400, 82nd Congress. This Act amends the Fulbright Act by broadening the source of foreign currencies and credits available for exchanges and other purposes. For example, it makes available not only currencies acquired as a result of surplus property disposals, but also other currencies of foreign governments "held or available for expenditure by the United States or any agency thereof . . . not required by law or agreement with such Government to be expended or used for any other purpose."

However, these currencies are also available for other activities of the United States Government, such as the Department's administrative expenses abroad, purchase and rent of foreign buildings and foreign currency expenses of the Defense Department and other United States agencies. If expenditures for these activities should exhaust foreign credit balances due the United States, the Department would be unable to buy such currencies from the Treasury Department even though dollars might be appropriated by Congress for this purpose.

Program Activities and Accomplishments

Exchange programs under the Act were planned and put into operation for the first time in Germany, Sweden, Ceylon, Finland, and the Union of South Africa, with which agreements were signed in 1952. The program with Germany involved the first large scale movement of American students to that area since the outbreak of World War II. Foundations and Commissions in Scandinavian countries pooled their knowledge and experience in getting new exchange programs quickly underway in Sweden and Finland. Arrangements were worked out between these countries for the interchange of American lecturers and other grantees to achieve maximum program effectiveness.

Altogether, exchange programs were carried out with 25 countries involving 1,606 American and 2,576 foreign grantees. Included were grants to foreign students to attend American sponsored schools abroad, such as the American University in Beirut—long recognized as a bulwark of American influence in the Near East.

These exchanges, representing an expenditure of \$7,303,075 in foreign currencies, could not have been carried out without the dollar assistance provided by the Smith-Mundt Act. Equally important was the financial support provided by private and other non-U.S. Government groups. Foreign currencies, for example, cannot pay for grantees' expenses within the United States, or for program and administrative costs in this country. Altogether, \$2,500,000 was made available under the Smith-Mundt Act, \$1,000,000 under

special programs for Germany, Austria and Finland, and approximately \$7,000,000 by non-U.S. Government sources to achieve maximum utilization of these foreign currencies for exchange purposes.

The following table indicates the scope of the exchange program in each country: [See p. 891.]

To increase the effectiveness of grants to individual students, teachers, lecturers and research scholars, a number of projects were developed. These included *group projects*, such as American Studies Conferences and Seminars, in which all categories of grantees as well as the general public participated; *joint projects*, such as the foreign lecturer program in small American colleges, which the John Hay Whitney Foundation financed jointly with the Department to enable outstanding foreign lecturers to teach at lesser-known American educational institutions; and *special projects*, such as the one recently planned for South East Asian journalists whereby they will spend two months touring the United States and attend a special workshop including lectures by outstanding American journalists and political figures arranged by the American Press Institute at Columbia University under a Rockefeller Foundation grant.

American Studies projects were designed to meet the increasing interest abroad in our history, literature and culture, for a better understanding of our role in the world today. For example, one of the outstanding developments of the year was the increase in the number of short-term conferences on American studies, which were held in the United Kingdom, Norway, the Netherlands, Pakistan and India. A special group project in American civilization was arranged for teachers from Denmark, Norway, France, Sweden and the Netherlands at American universities.

American studies continued to be taught in foreign universities as a result of the program. A recent example is the special chair in American literature and history established in Belgium at the University of Liège, to be filled annually by an American lecturer. Altogether, courses in American studies are now being offered at universities in Denmark, Norway, Germany, Belgium, France, India, Japan, Greece and Italy. In addition, individual American lecturers in the general field of American studies have been assigned to practically all of the 25 countries participating in the program, including critical Near and Far Eastern areas.

Teacher exchanges are vital channels, not only for reaching impressionable youth groups abroad who are groping for answers to the world's social and political problems, but also for influencing many important community groups. Altogether, more than 271 American and 236 foreign teachers were exchanged during this period. These exchanges included a teacher education project under which foreign teachers visited the United

Awards Made in 1953

Country	Grants to Americans				Grants to foreign nationals				Scholarships, American schools abroad	Total
	Lec-turers	Re-search scholars	Teach-ers	Stu-dents	Lec-turers	Re-search scholars	Teach-ers	Stu-dents		
Australia	8	4	7	28	10	12	9	30	..	108
Austria	8	7	5	51	3	12	5	70	5	166
Belgium-Luxembourg	3	7	4	19	2	10	9	36	2	92
Burma	3	4	1	2	..	1	5	2	..	18
Ceylon	2	1	5	16	..	24
Denmark	6	6	2	19	1	10	5	51	3	103
Egypt	15	4	7	5	5	15	7	27	15	100
Finland	5	4	..	7	2	4	18	44	..	84
France	13	16	29	232	7	47	45	198	7	594
Germany	15	16	12	192	5	25	8	178	12	463
Greece	8	2	25	6	..	7	9	40	201	298
India	10	..	7	16	6	13	12	76	..	140
Iraq	9	1	2	1	1	2	..	26	4	46
Italy	12	24	16	106	4	38	21	89	6	316
Japan	18	10	7	18	2	38	36	149	..	278
Netherlands	10	5	22	39	4	13	16	57	..	166
New Zealand	3	4	5	14	..	8	7	14	..	55
Norway	5	8	4	25	3	36	15	65	9	170
Pakistan	7	1	4	2	..	9	4	37	..	64
Philippines	12	5	..	2	..	49	..	68
Sweden	7	..	8	..	15
Thailand	4	1	4	1	..	1	..	29	107	147
Turkey	1	5	..	11	13	30
Union of South Africa	1	1	1	..	3
United Kingdom	23	38	106	184	23	86	..	174	..	634
Total	199	163	271	973	78	401	236	1,477	384	14,182

¹ The difference between this figure and the 4,503 selections made by the Board of Foreign Scholarships represents 321 persons who were unable to accept awards.

States for six month periods, studying and observing American school systems; teacher interchanges, whereby American and foreign teachers were enabled to trade positions in their respective school systems for a full year; and summer seminars abroad for American teachers, such as those held last summer in France and Italy for teachers of French and Italian languages and cultures.

An important part of the teacher program is the training of foreign teachers in English teaching methods. A wider knowledge of English not only helps to remove language barriers to international understanding but also helps to awaken and maintain interest in American life. This program included English language training of foreign teachers in this country, the holding of teacher seminars in foreign countries to review English teaching methods, source materials and publications, and the sending of American teachers abroad to conduct English classes for teachers and students. Typical of the latter was the American teacher in Thailand who, noting her students' interest in the American presidential elections, arranged for a mock convention in English. Through such methods as these she not only helped her students to improve rapidly their English

language fluency, but to increase their understanding of the United States.

A new development in the program was the extension of grant opportunities to non-academic persons, such as Japanese labor leaders, South East Asian journalists, and German government officials. These projects were made possible by the decision of the Board of Foreign Scholarships to include foreign specialists whose programs are carried out in cooperation with approved educational institutions.

In carrying out their studies, teaching and research, American grantees often have opportunities to undertake additional community activities which extend their influence beyond the classroom. In the United Kingdom, for instance, an American student pursuing his studies in theology at the University of Edinburgh, has also spent some of his free time on clerical work in a poor Edinburgh district, where he preaches and visits regularly the church's parishioners. In Italy, an American research scholar won the respect and liking of a large circle of friends, including shopkeepers, workers and artisans, in carrying out a sociological study of an Italian village. A large Italian industrial firm, recognizing the

value of the study in future town planning for its employees, provided office space and staff assistance, and prevailed upon the American to stay and complete the study upon the termination of his grant.

In Turkey, a group of American grantees provided a lecture series, open to the general public in cooperation with the United States Information Service, covering such varied subjects as "American business methods and production techniques", "The importance of sportsmanship and fair play in American sports", and "American art and literature". In India, an American lecturer established a school of journalism in an Indian university, and toured the country meeting editors and visiting newspaper and printing plants. Many other instances could be cited of this growing tendency of the program to reach beyond university circles, such as the seminar in Norway for labor leaders, the citizenship education projects launched in Philippine communities by an American lecturer, and the work of American teachers there in bringing modern scientific methods of agriculture to outlying farming communities.

In many countries, associations of former grantees have been formed. These groups are active in keeping alive interest in our country, as well as in maintaining American contacts. United States Foundations and Commissions also try to keep in touch with unsuccessful candidates because of their interest in the United States. They are often invited to attend local seminars on American studies, placed on mailing lists for other functions sponsored by the United States Information Service and provided with surplus United States Information Service books.

Evaluation of the Program

Evaluation studies continued to be made during 1953 to assess the effectiveness of the over-all exchange program in promoting favorable attitudes towards the United States, and in increasing understanding between the United States and other countries. These studies have resulted so far in the following general conclusions:

(1) The exchange experience causes foreign grantees to change unrealistic and stereotyped views of American life, particularly with regard to the status of the family, the place of religion in our national life, and the moral standards of Americans. These changed attitudes can help combat anti-American propaganda more effectively than any overt efforts on our part, since they result from convictions arising from having observed the conduct and behavior of Americans on a face-to-face basis.

(2) Grantees obtained a more favorable view of the motives behind American foreign policy—thereby strengthening beliefs in the genuineness of our desire to prevent war, and weakening beliefs that our foreign policy is motivated by imperi-

alistic designs. These views can help the United States in promulgating ideals and policies in consonance with our aims.

(3) Such increased understanding of the United States, although basically perhaps immeasurable, usually takes some observable form after grantees return home. Judging from what our cultural officers were able to observe in a special study of returned grantees, well over half are definitely known to be reporting favorably and actively to their fellow countrymen—in speeches, published writings, conversations, etc.—about their experiences in America. It is safe to assume that a much greater proportion of grantees engage in such activities.

American grantees have also gained a wider understanding of the cultural, political and economic life of other countries, according to a major evaluation study carried out in 1953. In addition, they have come to develop an understanding and appreciation of our own international problems. It was found that considerable professional benefits also resulted from their exchange experience, and that former grantees were active in extending hospitality to foreign visitors under the program, in sharing experiences with their local communities through talks, appearances on radio and television programs, and through publications.

The recent findings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's Subcommittee on Overseas Information Programs tend to support these conclusions. For example, the Committee reported that the program "enjoys a high prestige both at home and abroad, and is therefore able to attract the voluntary participation of leading citizens. . . . Exchangees often are or may become prominent in government, business and the professions, and their potential impact on attitudes towards this country is considerable.

Evaluation studies were also made of certain operational matters in efforts to further improve the program. For example, one study showed that certain foreign students obtained better orientation through living in American homes for a short period, than through orientation courses at universities. As a result, emphasis has been given to this method of orientation—which is also less expensive than university courses. Another study was made of the performances of individual American grantees abroad, as a guide to screening committees in making future selections. Additional studies included a survey of the English language proficiency of foreign teachers as it affected their experiences in this country.

Administration

ADMINISTRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

The Department of State—Prior to the creation of the United States Information Agency on

August 1, 1953, by Reorganization Plan Number 8, the Educational Exchange Programs and International Information Programs were administered by the International Information Administration of the Department of State. The retention of the Exchange Programs in the Department of State, at the time the Information Program was transferred to a separate agency, was in harmony with the views of the Senate's special Subcommittee, referred to above. This Subcommittee recommended that the exchange program be expanded and retained in the Department of State, noting that "the program is non-political and nonpropagandistic in character."

The responsibilities of the Department for this program are to a great extent supervisory, since certain operational functions are performed in the United States by public and private agencies having special competence in the exchange fields concerned, and overseas by bi-national United States Educational Foundations and Commissions set up for this purpose.

The Department's responsibilities include policy and administrative guidance to these agencies, the negotiation of agreements with foreign countries for the use of foreign currencies, the coordination of exchange activities for which it has responsibility with exchange programs of other Government and private agencies, authorization for expenditure of funds by United States Foundations and Commissions overseas, the review of individual country programs and budgets, and evaluation of over-all program effectiveness. The Department also provides staff services for the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

The Board of Foreign Scholarships—Pursuant to the Act, a Board of Foreign Scholarships, appointed by the President, has the responsibility for supervising the program, selecting candidates, and determining which educational institutions are qualified to participate.

The Board, which serves without compensation, was composed of the following members as of December 31, 1953: Mr. Frederick L. Hovde, president of Purdue University, who was elected Chairman of the Board during 1953; Miss Margaret Clapp, president of Wellesley College, who was elected Vice Chairman during 1953; Brigadier General John N. Andrews, personal representative of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Veterans Administration; Mr. Samuel M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education; Mr. Charles S. Johnson, president of Fisk University; Mr. Walter Johnson, chairman of the Department of History, University of Chicago; Mr. Martin R. P. McGuire, professor of Greek and Latin, Catholic University of America; Dr. Francis Scott Smyth, dean of the Medical School, University of California; Miss Helen C. White, professor of English, University of Wisconsin; and Mr. Philip H. Willkie, lawyer and representative to the Indiana Legislature. The Executive Sec-

retary is Mr. Francis J. Colligan, Deputy Director of the International Educational Exchange Service of the Department.

The Board held four meetings in 1953, as well as 16 meetings of its subcommittees on selections, planning, and stipends. During this period, the Board selected 4,503 candidates for awards, approved 27 additional educational institutions abroad for participation in the program, and reviewed and approved annual country programs sponsored by United States Educational Foundations and Commissions abroad. In selecting American citizens, the Board, pursuant to the Act, gave preference to veterans provided all other qualifications were equal. For example, of the 1,606 American students, teachers, lecturers, and research scholars receiving awards during 1953, 489 were veterans of either World War I, World War II, or Korea.

Among the significant policy decisions taken by the Board during 1953 were: (1) approval of the general framework within which American studies conferences can be developed overseas; (2) extension of the program to non-academic persons and fields, by approving projects under which journalists from South East Asian countries and labor leaders from Japan can receive travel grants; (3) the development overseas of centers for the study of linguistic sciences; and (4) recommendations for improving the State scholar program.

Cooperating Agencies—The four agencies in this country which assist the Department under contract or working fund agreements are the American Council on Education, which provides certain services for teacher exchanges with American elementary and secondary schools abroad; the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, for research scholar and lecturer exchanges; the Institute of International Education, for candidates for study awards; and the United States Office of Education, for teacher exchanges with foreign elementary and secondary schools. These agencies perform such services as accepting and reviewing applications for awards, confirming placement in American educational institutions, arranging programs and itineraries, counseling foreign grantees while in this country, and enlisting monetary support from non-governmental groups for the purpose of increasing opportunities for study, research and teaching under the program.

These agencies are also active in disseminating information about the program and in enlisting the voluntary support of local groups to carry out various program functions. For instance, approximately 1,000 Fulbright advisors on American college campuses cooperated with the Institute of International Education in disseminating information about scholarship opportunities to American students. These advisors also assisted local preliminary selection committees in screen-

ing and recommending candidates. The Office of Education disseminated information on teacher exchange opportunities through its contacts with superintendents of public schools throughout the country, junior colleges and other teacher training institutions. It also utilizes the services of 54 regional teacher interviewing committees as a part of the screening process. The Conference Board and the American Council on Education utilize similar groups in obtaining qualified American candidates in lecturer, research scholar and teacher categories.

Arrangements were made during this period to simplify the administration of future teacher exchange programs by transferring to the Office of Education the processing of teacher exchanges for American schools abroad, formerly performed by the American Council on Education. This change consolidates responsibility for the administration of all teacher exchanges in the Office of Education.

ADMINISTRATION OVERSEAS

United States Educational Foundations and Commissions abroad, established pursuant to the Fulbright Act, administer the exchange program in each participating country in cooperation with the principal United States Foreign Service post. The activities of these bi-national groups include the disbursing of funds available for educational exchanges, disseminating information on opportunities for study, research or teaching in the United States, recommending to the Board of Foreign Scholarships foreign nationals and educational institutions for participation in the program, arranging institutional placement for American candidates recommended by the cooperating agencies, and providing orientation programs for American and foreign grantees. The Foundations and Commissions also submit for review and approval by the Department and the Board of Foreign Scholarships annual programs planned to reach exchange objectives within the needs and opportunities of each country.

Non-United States Government Financial Support

Private and other non-United States government groups supported the exchanges carried out

under the Fulbright Act by providing more than \$7,000,000 in assistance during 1953. These groups included colleges, universities, foundations, hospitals, and private businesses and industries. For example, the Ford Foundation continued its financial support of qualified lecturers and research scholars from Near and Far Eastern countries who lacked necessary dollar resources. Colleges and universities throughout the country provided tuition, maintenance and other scholarship assistance. Both American and foreign primary and secondary school systems provided stipends for American and foreign teachers under the teacher interchange program, and foreign governments provided dollar scholarship assistance to foreign travel grant recipients.

In addition to financial aid, both American and foreign groups provided a number of important services, without which the program could not operate effectively. For example, foreign student advisors helped orient foreign students to American college and community life, and provided hospitality and other services. Representatives of American businesses served without compensation as members of United States Educational Foundations and Commissions helping to supervise and administer the program in participating countries. Alumni associations overseas, foreign universities, bi-national foundations and others assisted in the screening and recommending of foreign candidates, and provided hospitality and orientation for American grantees newly arrived in their countries.

Not to be overlooked are the many private individuals, civic and other community groups in the United States who offer program and hospitality services to foreign grantees—an important factor in the grantee's experience of American life. It is estimated that over 10,000 private American citizens assisted the program in these and other ways during 1953.

Special "State Committees", appointed by the Governors of each State and Territory, continued to recommend panels of candidates for State Scholarships, under a plan whereby two student scholarships are reserved for legal residents of each State and Territory.

Canada. U.S. Asks Approval for Construction of Libby Dam (text of application)	878
China. The United States and a Divided China (Jenkins)	859
Czechoslovakia. Czechoslovak Protest Concerning Crusade for Freedom Rejected	881
Economic Affairs	
Understanding Inter-American Economic Problems (Bohan)	875
U.S. Asks Approval for Construction of Libby Dam (text of application)	878
Educational Exchange. A Report on Educational Exchange Under the Fulbright Act in 1953	889
Ethiopia	
Ethiopia's Role in World Affairs (Haile Selassie I; Eisenhower)	867
Registration of Base Agreement With Ethiopia	871
Visit of Haile Selassie I	871
Germany. German Interzonal Travel (Conant-Semenov letters)	879
Guatemala. Communist Influence in Guatemala (Dulles)	873
Iceland. U.S. and Iceland Agree on Implementing of Defense Agreement	884
India. The Growth of Freedom in India (Allen)	864
International Information. Czechoslovak Protest Concerning Crusade for Freedom Rejected	881
International Organizations and Meetings	
Calendar of Meetings	885
Five-Power Military Talks	864
Latvia. Accreditation of Latvian Chargé d'Affaires (Spekke; Dulles)	882
Military Affairs. Five-Power Military Talks	864
Mutual Security	
Registration of Base Agreement With Ethiopia	871
Technical Cooperation and the American Heritage (Stassen)	871
U.S. and Iceland Agree on Implementing of Defense Agreement	884
U.S. Policy on Participation in Collective Defense (Dulles)	862
Non-Self-Governing Territories. Thermonuclear Tests in Pacific Trust Territory (Lodge; Marshallese petition)	886
Publications. Current U.N. Documents	888
Treaty Information	
Current Actions	884
The Genocide Convention	882
Registration of Base Agreement With Ethiopia	871
U.S. and Iceland Agree on Implementing of Defense Agreement	884

Turkey. Visit of Turkish Prime Minister	879
United Nations. Current U.N. Documents	888

Name Index

Allen, George V.	864
Bohan, Merwin L.	875
Conant, James B.	880
Dulles, Secretary	862, 864, 871, 873, 878, 879, 882
Eisenhower, President	870
Jenkins, Alfred leSesne	859
Lodge, Henry Cabot, Jr.	886
Menderes, Adnan	879
Selassie I, Haile	867, 871
Semenov, Vladimir	879
Spekke, Arnolds	882
Stassen, Harold E.	871

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: May 24-30

Releases may be obtained from the News Division, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Press releases issued prior to May 24 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 258 of May 15 and 264 of May 19.

No.	Date	Subject
274	5/24	Latvian Chargé accredited
*275	5/24	Dulles: Red Cross League message
*276	5/24	Haile Selassie's program
277	5/24	Reply to Czechoslovak note
278	5/24	Conant: Interzonal German travel
279	5/25	Dulles: Guatemalan situation
280	5/25	Dulles: Haile Selassie's visit
281	5/25	Dulles: Adnan Menderes' visit
†282	5/25	Protocol to convention with U.K.
283	5/25	Dulles: Five-power military talks
284	5/25	Dulles: Statement on Indochina
285	5/25	Dulles: Rio Treaty
286	5/26	Treaty with Iceland
287	5/27	Construction of Libby Dam
†288	5/27	Convention with Belgium
289	5/28	Ethiopian agreement registered
†290	5/28	Foreign Relations volume
†291	5/28	Delegation to Labor Conference

*Not printed.

†Held for a later issue of the BULLETIN.



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

Foreign Relations of the United States . . .

the *basic source* of information on U.S. diplomatic history

1936, Volume V, The American Republics

Besides dealing with multilateral aspects of economic and political questions involving the United States and other American Republics, this volume includes also correspondence on the bilateral relations between the United States and the governments of 19 American Republics.

Of chief interest in the record on multilateral negotiations are (1) the preliminary documentation on the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace held at Buenos Aires; (2) correspondence on the Chaco Peace Conference, which achieved agreement of Bolivia and Paraguay to a Protocolized Act putting into effect recommendations of the Conference, and resumption of diplomatic relations between the two former belligerents.

More than two-thirds of the correspondence on bilateral relations is concerned with commercial and financial topics, particularly with the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Copies of this volume, the last to be issued in the series of five *Foreign Relations* volumes for the year 1936, may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., for \$4.50 each.

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$.....
(cash, check, or
money order).

Please send me copies of *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1936, Volume V, The American Republics.*

Name:

Street Address:

City, Zone, and State: